

C 25 Je '23

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy

THE

LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

VOL. LIII—NO. 2.

APRIL, 1923.

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT
1923

CONTENTS

I. The Steps in the Founding of a United Lutheran Church in India	137
By Rev. L. B. Wolf, D.D.	
II. Our Neighbors—The Heathen	160
By Rev. George Drach, D.D.	
III. The Freedom of the Will—Holman Lecture on Article XVIII of Augsburg Confession..(Conclusion).	165
By Rev. L. Franklin Gruber, D.D., LL.D.	
IV. Theories Concerning the Person of Christ,	190
By Rev. A. E. Deitz, D.D.	
V. The Theory of Moral Obligation.	205
By Prof. Jacob M. Hantz, D.D., LL.D.	
VI. Current Theological Thought.	228
In English. By J. A. Singmaster, D.D.	
In German. By J. L. Neve, D.D.	
VII. Review of Recent Literature.	244
Apologetics.—God or Gorilla—The Truth of Christianity—Our Protestant Heritage—Matter and Spirit—Apology and Polemic in the New Testament—A System of Christian Evidence. The Ministry. —The Ministry as a Life Work. Devotional. —The Message of Stewardship—Common Service Book with Hymnal. Social Problems. —The Social Unrest, Capital, Labor, and the Public in Turmoil—Reconstruction of Religion. Social Reform. —Familiar Talks on that Boy and Girl of Yours. Sociology. —Problems of the New World—Facing Reality. Sociological. —The Validity of Amer- ican Ideals. Dogmatics. —The Temptation of Our Lord—The In- carnation and Personality—Creative Christianity—The New Test- ament To-day—The Fundamentals of Christianity. Hymnology. —The Story of the American Hymn—Jesus of Nazareth—The Un- seen Side of Child Life. Christian Narrative. —The Training of Children in the Christian Family—Child versus Parent. Story Ser- mons. —Old Joe and Other Stories. Ways of Serving. —Modern Christian Callings. Miscellaneous. —The Return of Christendom.	

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1923.

ARTICLE 1.

THE STEPS IN THE FOUNDING OF A UNITED LUTHERAN CHURCH IN INDIA.

SHALL THERE BE A NATIONAL LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE INDIA EMPIRE?

BY REV. L. B. WOLF, D.D.

After epitomizing the Gospel to be preached in the non-christian world, the Church Missionary Society in its general instructions to outgoing missionaries, old and new, proceeded to set forth the ultimate end of all Missions thus: "As you go forth to proclaim this Christ, you are also called to be wise master-builders. The plan is that the Church should spread from country to country. Your aim is to plant no branch of a foreign Society, but the local Church of Christ, carrying responsibility for evangelization, bringing in the Kingdom of God—a Church with the Bible as its guide and authority, with its ordered ministry and sacraments."

We have used this statement of a great missionary body, not because we agree with it in all it says, but because we believe it to be essentially right as to the aim of missionary endeavor. It should be of interest to our American Lutheran churches to follow somewhat in detail what our Lutheran missionaries have done in the

work of founding the Church of Christ in one of its chief Mission Fields. It would be most interesting and not unprofitable, to answer the question at great length, viz. Should a National Church be established in the Empire of India? But it may in passing be enough to say that it is too soon to attempt to weigh this question in all its implications. A movement is on foot to unify the existing denominations and establish an India Church of Christ. In South India even the Episcopal Church is seriously considering uniting their Missions with the Congregational, Dutch Reformed, the Scotch Presbyterian and some other bodies, into one united Organization. In other parts of India the same idea has been growing.

The indigenous churches planted by the various bodies are in some degree sympathetic with this, but certain leaders of more than ordinary standing and influence look upon it as too much fostered by outside influences and too little the outcome of the India churches' own thinking and planning. In a statement recently uttered at a Bangalore Conference the following will help somewhat to clear the atmosphere and may not be so far wrong on Church union, as arrived at from an India standpoint. The resolutions are prefaced by a statement that there must be, "A full recognition of the unity and spiritual equality of the different denominations." The effort toward Church union now carried on "proceeds on the basis that the adoption of a uniform system of Church government is a condition precedent to such unity. This attitude does not faithfully reflect the Indian Christian mind. The vast majority of Indian Christian laymen and even clergymen feel "that no existing difference should hinder the full realization of Christian friendship and would gladly welcome the immediate introduction of inter communion, interchange of pulpits, and intercelebration of the Sacraments."—They would hence urge that larger schemes be deferred until the Indian Christian opinion makes such demand.

Then follow the resolutions which show clearly the Indian mind.

(1) "That this Conference of Indian Christians, consisting of members belonging to the Anglican, Wesleyan, Lutheran, Baptist, Presbyterian, South India United Church denominations, held at Bangalore, is of the opinion that the several denominations of the Christian Church are in all essential respects within the one Church Catholic and that in the interests of true Christian fellowship and for the extension of the Kingdom of Christ in this land, a recognition of the equal status of the denominations within the one Church of Christ, and their ministries as of equal validity, is necessary.

(2), That such recognition (Sic) should be given effect to along the following lines:

(a) Ministers may receive due authorization to minister fully and freely in the churches of other denominations, it being understood that the above authorization is not to be regarded as reordination or as repudiation of the present position of their ministers as validly ordained. Ministration would mean preaching interchange of pulpits, and administration of sacraments.

(b) All the denominations should recognize fully the members of one another and admit them to the Lord's table.

(3) That in the opinion of this Conference, further negotiations towards union of an organic character should not take place until the above two resolutions have been given practical effect to and until the Indian Churches have attained financial and administrative independence, which, it is hoped, will conserve the best elements of Indian religious experience.

(4) That this Conference feel confident of the general approval of Resolution 2 by the laity of the different denominations and therefore calls upon them to do all in their power to bring about intercommunion, interchange of pulpits and intercelebration of the sacraments without any reference to organizational union."

Another question naturally arises: What should be done in so vast a land as India, with such an undoubted future for Christ's Church, as to our western divisions, both as expressed in our deeds and church polity? Shall the Church that shall ultimately arise, be in church polity, Presbyterial or Episcopalian? Shall it in doctrine be Armenian, Reformed, Calvanistic or Lutheran? In fine, shall it be theocentric or Christocentric in its doctrinal conception? Shall it be Pedo-Baptist or Baptist only? Shall it teach only the four Ecumenical creeds of Christendom or all the subsequent modifications which have given rise to the infinite varieties of missionaries who are at work in the India Empire? It is hardly possible that we in the homeland half appreciate with what perplexity all these many names of the Church of Christ are regarded by the rapidly rising groups of Christians, who have been called by faith in our Lord by any one of the various groups in such a mission field. It will not answer the question to say: We all believe in Christ. The reply will be, why then do you not all belong together and have a common name, such as the Church of Christ? Here you are calling yourselves in one part of India, Methodists, and in another Wesleyans. Here you are now Protestant Episcopalian, or Methodist Episcopalian. Now, we hear of Dutch Reformed, and again only Reformed. Now this and now that view of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper is emphasized. What do these things mean to the Christian, who has left heathenism but a short time and has joined himself to Jesus Christ and entered his Church may be asked? It is admitted that those converts who are best informed, quite appreciate the distinctions, but many there are even among them who think they do not appeal very strongly to oriental minds. In the midst of it all, stands the monumental cleavage between Protestant Catholic and Roman Catholic faiths, and it must be confessed that there is almost bound to be confusion within the India churches. Amid it all, there are those whose altars and pulpits are only open to those

who belong to a certain body of Christians and who exclude from altar and pulpit fellowship, all others, irrespective of faith or life and character. All will agree that Christian Missions have created a complex situation. It is too soon perhaps to see the way out.

It may be suggested that India has one National Christian group, ending in Bishops and a Pope that will form itself around an ecclesiastical hierarchy or order of priests, and maintain Rome with its rigidity of government and wealth of tradition and culture, with its extra-scriptural doctrines. The vast numbers that now confess their faith in Christ under this Roman form seem to justify us in the conclusions that one group of Christians is certain in India—viz. the Roman, with its hierachial and papal ideas and pretensions.

But what of finely divided Protestantism? If it will follow in doctrinal teaching, if it can modify priestly ideas, sufficiently to admit an Episcopate, as a good form of church polity, if it could under this modification make such an approach to the Presbyterial bodies, that mutual agreement might be reached on all matters of church government, and ministerial orders, then there would be a second large group formed, which in the main, in doctrine would accept the Reformed teaching of our faith and a modified polity that would combine congregational Presbyterial and Episcopal forms of government. This is the effort now on foot in India as referred to above.

But this would still leave a considerable body among all the above bodies who do not stress polity or regard the validity of the Sacraments dependent on Episcopacy, but base all their faith on the teaching of God's Word as supreme in faith and practice. As they think, the views they hold on the Sacraments are such that they cannot feel at home among that group or those groups which minimize the historic teaching of the church in their views of Baptism and the Holy Communion. Those who have been accustomed to commune at the altars of the Episcopal Church, those Lutheran converts who have accepted the teaching of the churches of the Reformation

on Baptism and the Holy Communion, and many in the various groups who emphasize faith in its content as well as in its practice, are almost certain to form an ecclesiastical body, which in its Christian thought and life will more readily coalesce in that organized group which is insistent, that only in faith thus confessed, can true spiritual life and true union be found. So after much differentiation and after vast concessions we might expect a regrouping of the Christians of India, some time in the future, in these three bodies.

It might be admitted, though it is by no means a certainty, that church polity may yield the field first. Some think it is now showing such signs of yielding, while others are not so sanguine. It is at least likely that Christian thinking in the India Churches will follow the more spiritual and subtle interpretation of God's Word, and, if this be a correct view, the India churches will accept the doctrinal basis for their grouping rather than the more natural or rationalistic. In fine the mystical elements of our Christian thinking as expressed in our doctrines will influence more than any other matters either of form or substance. The Hindu mind is subtle and does not hesitate at the deep and inscrutable mysteries of our Holy faith.

Such a situation hence as the above would warrant not one but several national religious Christian groups. What shall result when the India churches shall raise up their own leaders and do their own thinking, time alone can discover. We want to emphasize this outstanding fact, that the India churches have already shown by their leadership that a future church in India will arise that will be self-conscious, self-expressive, Christo-centric in its theology and democratic in its polity in large part. We are aware that many will not agree with this statement, but after all, India will have the best chance of any nation thus far to reach one of these three goals,—Self-consciousness, Christo-centricty and democracy. A nation (unless we mistake its true psychology) that has been ruled from above with an iron hand, both by king

and priest for centuries will not establish an organization in the name of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, whose teaching was the most democratic of all teachers of the past, unless it revolve around Him as its center, find Him its head. India's self-appointed task, it seems to me, will be to exalt only Christ and to regard in love all fellow-believers as brothers in Him.

We turn now to follow some step in the founding of our Lutheran Church in South India. It may be impossible in this article to do more than review what has transpired in one Lutheran field and then note briefly what seems the tendency among all Lutheran Bodies in the India Empire on the question of a United Lutheran Church and the status that had been reached at the outbreak of the world-war.

The early movements of our Lutheran Church in India can only be glanced at. Two hundred and sixteen years have elapsed since a fair start to present our faith-conceptions to Hindus was made. It resulted in a rich fruitage, and in numerous believers. No organization, but the Mission emerged. The founder, missionary Zeiggenbalg, rejected the idea of becoming a bishop and so the Lutheran faith and not its polity became the rallying cry of the churches of the early times. The middle of the 18th century saw these early efforts of Lutheranism brought almost to a stand-still or largely taken over by others. A period of years saw no large effort put forth, until modern missionaries renewed their efforts in the beginning of the 19th century. Near the middle of this century the American Lutheran church sent its first representatives to continue the work and redeem the pledges, which Lutherans cannot but redeem, as they confess their faith in their Lord and Christ.

In the work of the missionaries of the American Lutheran Church, whose steps we desire to trace, we can ever rejoice. Its first leaders, their bold spirit and wise planning, deserve our study and deep appreciation. They all truly and zealously preached Christ and found a

fruitage in their early ministry which rejoiced the home churches and led to deeper interest and larger support.

The early reports show what ideas stirred in their minds. When the first missionaries had only a handful of converts, hardly more than 100, scattered in district villages, despised by their richer neighbors, ignorant of human knowledge, but strong in their devotion to Christ, whom they lately had confessed, they began to establish an organized church by the founding of the India Synod, and in 1853 knocked at the doors of the General Synod in America for entrance. While it did not deem it proper to admit this Body to synodical standing, the Minutes of the first Convention were spread on the Minutes of the General Synod and the technical and other difficulties were pointed out to the India Synod. They, were, however, invited to correspond with the American Body, and were informed that delegates would be received. It was felt that some organization, which the rising churches could see before their eyes, must be formed, and the only way to set this before them in a real way was to organize, as American Lutheran ministers and others, a Synod. This Synod was many years in advance of the needs of the India churches. There was not an organized congregation at that time, but it was widely felt that some central show of authority was necessary. This, the first India Synod, remained in existence until its missionaries one by one died, or returned to the homeland. Then the civil war broke out in U. S. A. and it was followed by the home divisions among our Lutherans.

After these great events, one missionary alone was left, to carry on the work for a number of years and no organization was possible. From 1870 nothing of an organized Church character arose for many a long year. In course of time, the missionaries selected Indian men as their helpers. As these increased in education and were successfully indoctrinated, they proceeded to set them apart to the Gospel ministry according to the simple usage of Lutheranism. Following the advice of leaders in the home land between 1870-1890 four men,

the Revds. B. John, M. Nathaniel, Mr. Cully and P. Ramachendya were selected and given appointment as native ministers and superintendents in the fields. They took seats as ordained men in the Mission Conference and voted on all matters except where their own personal interests were involved. This continued for many years, and was only discontinued by death and withdrawal. As yet the native churches had no share in this act, it was done by the Mission churches alone. This anomaly continued until the churches in 1903 had a membership of 13,500 members and there were more than 500 Christian workers engaged in supervising and helping to train the growing churches. The Mission held in its hand all Ecclesiastical authority and while the India churches made contributions to selfsupport in a considerable amount, no part was given them in the expenditures of funds or the management of the missionary operations in their midst. Ordination was withheld from the Christian workers of the Mission, which in some cases might have been readily performed. The spirit of caution characterized the Mission leadership to such an extent as to lead to no real organic church life. The writer was then President of the Mission Conference and had the opportunity to observe the great details that those engaged in direct evangelistic work in the villages, congregational and school departments of the mission, had to face and discharge. The necessity to organize the village congregations became evident. Some such arrangement must be made to start a body that would begin gradually to assume charge of the rising congregations and set up some bounds and relationship between the Mission and the indigenous churches. In 1904 the Mission Conference authorized the President, Dr. L. B. Wolf, Revs. John Aberly and Isaac Cannaday to prepare a simple constitution for a Synod.

At the July meeting of the Conference they presented the first draft which was adopted and sent home for the approval of the Home Board of Foreign Missions.

Name—

This body shall be called the Guntur Synod of the American Evangelical Lutheran Church of the General Synod in the Guntur and adjacent Districts.

Object—

Its object shall be the consideration of all questions of an ecclesiastical character, church government, licensure, ordination and discipline of ministers, as well as the disposal of all funds locally contributed which may be entrusted to it by the A. E. L. M. Conference.

Membership—

Its membership shall consist of all ordained missionaries and of all ordained and licensed Pastors connected with the A. E. L. Mission; also of one lay-delegate from the charge of each missionary and of one from each self-supporting Pastorate, to be selected by the local Pan-chayat.

Officers—

Its officers shall consist of a President, Vice-President, Recording-Secretary and Treasurer, of whom the President and Treasurer shall be missionaries.

Duties of Officers—

1. The President shall call and preside over all meetings, sign all money orders, and shall be the Executive Officer of the Synod.
2. The Vice-President shall perform the duties of the President in his absence.
3. The Recording Secretary shall keep a record of all meetings, draw up and sign all money orders for money sanctioned by the Synod.
4. The Treasurer shall keep an account of all funds of the Synod, and shall disburse the same on an order from the President and Recording Secretary.

Duties and Privileges of Members—

All members shall have equal speaking and voting privileges on all questions brought before the Synod, except that lay-delegates shall not have the right to speak or vote on questions regarding the licensure, ordination or discipline of ministers.

Meetings—

The Synod shall meet semi-annually at the call of the President in connection with the semi-annual Convention of Workers. Special meetings may be called by the President at the request of one-third the members.

Amendments—

The Constitution shall be amended by a three-fourth's vote of the members present, provided that notice of such amendment shall be given at the previous regular meeting.

All matters not provided for in this Constitution, especially those regarding licensure, ordination and discipline of ministers, shall as far as practicable be dealt with in accordance with the Formula of Government of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, United States of America.

When this simple document so harmless in its proportions was first considered, the Body which it was intended to call into existence, was designated the "So-called Guntur Synod," and the movement was declared "most extraordinary and revolutionary." As such the Board "emphatically disapproved" of it and so informed the Mission Conference. From the first intimation of this organization it was natural that such should have been the reception of this India effort. It should be noted that the missionaries originated it. The Board's reply to the Conference also dealt with the question of ordination and rather doubted the procedure in the case of certain ordinations which the ordained missionaries had performed. The answer of the missionaries to the Home Board can best be understood if quoted *in extenso* as it throws much light upon the nature of our India Mission at this juncture.

"We would first call attention, however, to the fact that the proposed constitution of the body was sent to the Board for its consideration and confirmation, and that no steps were taken until the Board had ample time to consider the matter. If we had gone on and organized the Synod without reference to your body it would not

have been so much out of the way, provided we had first sought for honorable dismissal from the Synods of which we are members. But this we are not ready, for many reasons, to do. But the necessity of the Native Church demanded that we should organize some body in which our Native Pastors would have a part. We have done nothing more than to merge our existing Ministerium into a Synod, for the encouragement of the native Church in self-support, and for the beginning of self-government among our congregations. Our plans involve the establishment of a native Pastorate and the organization of charges on the lines of our American Church, as far as Indian circumstances may permit. We must teach self-government. The Synod will furnish the centre of such instruction. We have the churches and an excellent system of organization as a *Mission*, but this must be modified and changed into a form of government adapted to the needs of the Native Church; and this must be done only as fast as the Native Church is found worthy to assume such control.

"By associating with us our ordained and best men, we shall be laying the foundation of a Native Church. Its contributions, already considerable, are now managed by the Mission. It is proposed by the Conference to hand them over to the Synod to be voted by it to Pastorates or to the fields in which the pastorates shall eventually be organized and in this Synod the Native Church shall be given a share in the control, both of the funds and of all their affairs, under the guidance of the native Pastors, who shall be under the general supervision of the missionaries and associated with them also in the Synod. If the times are ripe to make a start (and they seem to be) in the organization of a true native Pastorate, it seems to us that our Ministerium furnished the required momentum to set it in motion and make it a success and regulate its work.

"Nothing more or less than the ultimate differentiation of the *Mission* and the Chuhch in India should be our goal, though it may be very far in the future. A

self-supporting and self-governing Church must be the aim, and our Synodical aspirations are only intended to bring us to this goal. We are in the beginning of things and as foreign missionaries we must occupy a two-fold position, be the managers of the Mission under the Board, and the pioneers of a native Church organization along the lines of our Lutheran polity so far as the circumstances may allow here in India. If this be "extraordinary and revolutionary" then all our work must be considered such, for toward a self-supporting and self-governing Church all our energies have been and should be directed.

"Whether we should withdraw from our home Synods and seek recognition for our Guntur Synod in the General Synod, are questions we have raised but have not answered. If the situation were a normal one, undoubtedly we should seek release from our home ties in our Synods, organize here as a Synod and apply for recognition to the General Synod. However, we are aware of the difficulties in the way. When the India Synod (1853-1859) applied, the technical and other difficulties were so many that all that could be recommended (see page 10 of Proceedings General Synod, 1853) was that the India Synod should correspond with the General Synod, and that delegates would be received; while the proceedings of the first India Synod were read on the floor of the General Synod and spread on its Minutes. But the Native Church presents no simple situation, and our attempts at organization must, after all, be largely tentative for years to come. However, this may be, we are sure that some part in the work of organization and direction must be given to our native brethren, and at present the merging of our Ministerium into a Synod in the manner proposed in our draft constitution presents the most feasible plan. If the Board has a more excellent way to suggest and one which will more fully meet the conditions of our Native Church, we await its suggestions. But we submit that our acts have not been in the spirit of usurped authority, nor have we deserved

the admonitions which the Board has seen fit to bestow upon us, under, it seems to us, the mistaken notion that we wished to set aside the Board's authority. To such a charge we plead not guilty. We want to assure the Board that in all matters in which we deem ourselves under its direction, we have been most amenable, and in all ecclesiastical matters we have taken the advice and counsel of the Board, as our reference to them of our draft constitution abundantly shows."

We have omitted parts. In the course of time, however, a more fully informed Board reconsidered its first action, and most heartily approved the Constitution with some very valuable amendments.

The Board in its minutes submitted the following to the India Conference:

"In reference to "The Guntur Synod" the formation of which has been proposed by the India Conference, and which was discountenanced by the Board, because of a lack of sufficient explanation of the nature and object of the said Synod, it was resolved:

1. That, in view of the full and satisfactory explanations which have recently been received from India concerning the proposed "Guntur Synod," the Board hereby rescinds its former action and gives its approval to the formation of "The Guntur Synod" along certain well defined lines to be expressed in a constitution.

2. That the nature and purpose of the said Synod may be more clearly understood we advise that the constitution be prefaced with a preamble clearly setting forth the reasons prompting the formation of the synod.

3. That the following Preamble be provisionally approved by the Board, and submitted to the India Conference for consideration:

Whereas, it is the aim of missionary labor not only to bear the Gospel to unevangelized and to lead them to Christ, but also to promote the establishment of self-supporting and self-governing Evangelical Lutheran Congregations, which shall grow eventually into an organized Lutheran Church, and

Whereas God has so signally blessed the work of missionaries in India that native Christians are numbered by the thousand, that scores of Congregations have been organized, and that native pastors are needed in larger numbers:

Resolved, therefore, that in the judgment of the India Conference and of the Board of Foreign Missions, the time is now ripe to take steps to form a Synod whose object and nature is set forth in the following Constitution, adopted by the India Conference with the approval of the Board of Foreign Missions:

When this preamble and the Constitution approved and somewhat amended by the Board were received the Conference took the matter into most careful consideration, and the final form of the Constitution was prepared for submission to the first meeting of the Synod which was called to meet in the Stork Memorial Church on the 29th day of October 1906. No act in the writer's missionary life of 25 years ever gave him so much joy and satisfaction as to issue the call for this meeting and suggest an order of business for the 1st session. The Rev. E. C. Harris, as the Synod's first Secretary, in reporting this first meeting to the Home Board writes:

"The First Convention of the Guntur Synod was held in the Stork Memorial Chapel, Guntur, India, on the 29th of October 1906, at 8.30 A. M. Dr. Wolf, the President of the Ministerium of Conference issued the call and suggested an order of business, which included the reading of the Constitution approved by the Board; presentation of credentials of delegates; election of officers, business handed over from the Ministerium, and new business. The Synodical Communion was observed on the previous Lord's Day evening, conducted by Dr. Uhl, at which all the Missionaries, Native Pastors and Delegates were present. The Synod proper was conducted by Dr. L. B. Wolf in charge of the opening devotional services. The Constitution was considered *seriatim* and so adopted with the exception of the minor changes."

The first important act of the Synod was to appoint a

committee to draft a model Constitution for congregations. At its first meeting there were present eleven ordained men of whom two were Indian Pastors and the remainder were foreign missionaries, and eleven lay-delegates, all Christian workers in the Mission, two of whom were sub-pastors. After 14 years it reported 27 clerical delegates of whom 12 were Indian ministers. The steady growth of the Synod's scope of operation in influence and usefulness and in authority fills all with satisfaction, who helped to found it and were permitted to assist in its development. It is now a strong, vigorous Body and directs under its Constitution the India churches and their parochial schools. It must eventually become the controlling organization of a self-propagating, self governing and self-supporting Church. At least a fair start has been made through which the Indian churches and their pastors and leaders can express themselves. The missionary is yet an essential factor in the infant church and exerts vast influence. But he is under changing and changed conditions in India and is beginning to realize more and more that he must be a sympathetic elder brother and cooperate in the establishment of a United Lutheran Church, if our various Lutheran Missions can agree as to the position that we jointly can fill in this great land. As yet the missionary holds membership in his home Synod, in the Mission Council and in the India Synod.

In the process of time, the Synod enacted two far-reaching and helpful provisions. The first pertains to charges and pastors, and the second to the funds of the native church.

"A charge shall consist of one congregation or a number of contiguous congregations, under one pastor." Then follows a clause to show the method of devotion of the Mission's power: "It shall also consist for the present, of the work of every ordained foreign missionary of whatever nature, who shall have the right to appoint, either a delegate-at-large from the church, or a member of the church who is working under him."

The funds of the Synod are disposed of in the following manner: "The funds at the disposal of the Synod shall consist of all contributions of the various congregations in the Mission except those devoted to special objects: * * * * And shall be devoted to the paying of the salaries of all ordained pastors, catechists and other workers as far as possible in the various Taluks (districts) in proportion to the offerings of each Taluk." "An annual statement shall be made to the Mission Conference showing both the number of workers supported by the funds of Synod and the amount of salary paid each." The support of the work in each district is supplemented by the Mission.

After the Constitution and By-Laws had been completed the organizers stated that, "in the matter of organization we feel that we have laid a firm foundation for the Synod." Since then little by little the native churches have been becoming autonomous, but as yet self-support of congregations and schools is only partial and the subsidy of the Mission and the Home Church must make up what is lacking. But after 16 years a fair start in self-government has been made and the way "to walk by walking" has again been demonstrated. Very much remains to be done. What step shall yet be taken?

What the goal set was in the first Constitution may be recalled. It was the ultimate separation of Mission and the Church. This contemplates the ultimate establishment of an indigenous India Church. It is not intimated that times are now ripe for it or the goal is about reached. Many a weary league remains to be traversed before the end will be attained.

When the first Indian ordained men had passed away, who had occupied seats in the Mission Conference, the question of their successors being accorded a seat in the Mission was settled. The governing Body of the Mission determined to give no place to Indian ordained men. The Synod was organized as the sphere of their influence, and the best school for their development. It was done

some may think rather arbitrarily, but such can hardly be a fair conclusion. It may be noted that the missionary members have full power in the Synod. So it was at first deemed wise to organize, but as an ultimate goal, the missionaries should expect no more than advisory power in the Native Church organization. The native churches must develop their own leaders, and these must finally control and govern the Indian Church.

The Mission has great tasks to perform during these times of transition, but it should recognize the fact that it should not do anything which the indigenous churches can do themselves, even when they do not perform it near as well as the Mission organization could. The vast field of Evangelization must be wisely cultivated by the Mission and the indigenous churches,—or by the Mission Council and the Synod of the India churches cooperating. Certain institutional spheres of influence may remain for many years in the hands of the Mission, but the Indian leaders should be invited to sit on Committees and their advice should be sought. In fine, the Mission organization and the Synod of India should learn well how to cooperate in all the tasks which must be performed to bring into existence a self-governing, self-supporting and self-propagating Church.

As is so essential in the Lutheran Church which does not depend on any form of church polity, which rests itself on the truth believed, taught and confessed as found in God's Word, which insists that where "the Word of God is rightly taught and the Sacraments are truly administered" there is the true Church, which denies the dogma that "where is the Bishop there is the church"; so we held that the united purpose in Mission and Synod must be to raise up such a spiritual body of believers, who regard the truth more essential than church polity, and practice and life more important than outward conformity.

This seems to differentiate the Lutheran Church from the high Church party of the Episcopal Church, that insists on an unbroken priesthood from the Apostles and

on the validity of the Sacraments administered by a threefold order of ministers episcopally ordained, and on the other hand, the many denominations that make little of doctrine and set little store by historical creeds; that are satisfied to conform with each other without giving the Scriptural grounds of each conformity and are carried away with modern thought and higher destructive criticism. Our Lutheran faith is made of sterner stuff than that of many others. Without being uncharitable we recognize that we of the Lutheran confession do have a place in the Christian Church, which cannot be given up unless Christianity will be the loser, and the total content of Protestant faith will be the poorer. We must bear our witness in our own way to the Deity of Christ Jesus, to His matchless Person and His atoning sacrifice on the cross; to His power to reveal Himself in the mystical union in the Holy Communion and in the faith, objective, which fills every believer with such profound trust in Him, the center of all our hopes and the joy of all our service. It must be such a ground as this which shall justify our India churches to set up for themselves a separate group of believers, so that they may without let or hindrance testify both what they believe and think. As a separate group of believers, within the Christian fold, that can more fearlessly and less offensively bear witness to all other groups of those making up the whole of Protestantism.

We believe that we have demonstrated, in the Christian world by our insistence of faith, and by the large number of followers in many lands of this faith, that India, in which we rank among the strongest Protestant Bodies, will be hospitable to the faith our churches confess and will welcome those who in the true spirit of Christ maintain it. We do not feel it vain to endeavor to set up a United Lutheran Church among the ten Missions which have founded groups in the various language-areas in different parts of the Empire.

This leads us to show what steps have been taken up to the present time to establish a United Lutheran

Church in India. When the writer went to India, each group of Lutheran missionaries was not only separated by miles of intervening space, but had no association whatever with one another. Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany and the United States of America, were represented in our Lutheran group and had no organic unity and no common aim except that which those had who desired to make Christ known to those unenlightened. No Lutheran Church consciousness was manifested. But general Missionary Conferences at different times paved the way and furnished the occasion for the separate groups of Lutherans to learn to know each other. The Hill Stations, where missionaries go to escape the torrid heat of the plains also played a part in bringing them together. Within the American group the first formal resolution, looking to closer cooperation, was proposed by Rev. W. P. Swartz in 1886 at a meeting of the Guntur Conference. Gradually the Missions in the Telugu area were drawn together and formed a simple organization in Guntur early in the Nineties of the 19th century. Each year the feeling grew stronger and stronger, until the Joint Telugu Conference met at Rajahmundry in 1904 and took steps to enlarge the territory of the Joint Telugu Conference and embraced all the Missions at work in the Madras Presidency. In 1905 the Leipsic, Hermansburg, Swedish, Guntur and Rajahmundry Missions met in Kodaikanal and established "The All-India Lutheran Literature Society." But before this, it should be remembered that in the Telugu Missions, the Lutheran missionaries had united in a paper and issued Sunday School literature. Among the resolutions passed in the organization of the "All-India Lutheran Literature Society, we quote the following:

"1. That the object of our various Missions and the cause of truth would be greatly helped, if such a Society was formed and in our opinion the time has come for the formation of such a Society.

"2. That we request our respective Boards to make grants toward its work and expenses when formed.

"3. That we take steps to publish our English monthly paper for educated Hindus, Christians and non-Christians and that we request Rev. L. B. Wolf, D.D., Guntur, to assume the editorship of same.

"4. That a Committee be appointed to carry out the resolutions.

"5. That this Committee act for the present as a Bureau of Information, * * * * with regard to Vernacular Literature."

The Committee subsequently met, entered into correspondence with the Home Boards, organized the Literature Society, authorized the monthly Journal, which was called the Gospel Witness and arranged the issue of the first edition on the 1st of September 1905. Everything was now ready to draw the Lutheran Missions into one organization or Conference. In 1906 the Bi-centenary of the establishment of the 1st Lutheran Mission, if not the first Mission, in India, was celebrated at Tranquebar and the event was signalized by the unveiling of the Jubilee Monument to Ziegenbalg and Plutschau on the spot where on the 9th of July 1706 the great pioneers landed. This occasion, at which were present representatives of all Lutheran Missions in India, naturally was most helpful in bringing about a closer union. Already the Committee of the "All-India Literature Society" had secured the hearty cooperation of all Home Boards and Missions and the Gospel Witness had by the first year of its existence, secured from each Mission an assistant editor. It is no wonder hence that the necessity of calling an "All India Lutheran Conference" to organize the whole of Lutheran India was deemed most urgent. The first Conference of all Lutheran Societies at work in India met in Guntur at the beginning of 1908 and the events of this and the second meeting hastened the idea of the founding of the United Lutheran College and Theological Seminary to which all Lutheran students might come. The College was to be opened at Guntur and the Theological Seminary at Madras. The 3rd, "All India Lutheran Conference," met in Guntur in October 1921, and the marked

difference between it and the first meeting was the very large Indian representation present, and their very active participation in its discussions. "If there were voices against a United Lutheran Church in India, they were those of foreigners and not those of Indian Christians themselves." Language difficulties exist, for our churches confess their faith in Hindi, Tamil, Telugu, Oriya, Malyalam, Munda, Oraon, Benjalee, Santalee and Khond. But a draft Constitution is now before the various Bodies and the prospect of a speedy union among the 200,000 Lutherans is very hopeful.

If anyone at home is inclined to doubt the doctrinal soundness of these India bodies, it may remove some of their doubts to read the first draft Constitution, which was the forerunner of all since then. We refer them also to the autonomous Gossner Lutheran Church where under great influence from without, under circumstances which make the efforts and tempting offers hard to resist, they showed their Lutheran training and rejected union with the Anglican Church after the world-war had deprived them both of their spiritual leaders and foreign support. They clearly maintained that nothing with them is paramount, but faith in Christ and that faith supported by God's Word. They plainly declared that in their conception of the Church they had no place for Bishops, as they understand the term from their associations with the Anglicans and the Roman Catholics. They insisted that Christ is the true head of the Church. His Sacraments are filled by His grace alone without the intervention of Priests or prelates and that a true ministry of the Church does not depend on Bishop or Pope. In these days, when creeds are at a discount, it would be helpful for some, to see what strong faith has resulted from the teaching of the Scriptural creeds of the historical Church, as found in harmony with God's Word.

It does not lie within the writer's purpose to predict what shall eventually be the form of India's Christianity. He believes it will be rich and full. With his past light and with his present convictions and present indications,

he is strongly inclined to the view that the Church that shall arise and be the final product of India's Christian thought, shall contain, at least three great elements; a deeper apprehension of Jesus as Lord and Christ, as the God—man, a clearer comprehension of the vast mysteries of the Cross and Passion of Christ and a form of Church polity that shall be, in large measure, popular, rather than exclusive, democratic rather than autocratic or prelatical.

The Holy Ghost shall through the Truth lead India and the rising Church to Christ, the true foundation, and founded on Him, built up in Him, the foes, nay, the "gates of hell" shall not prevail against Him and His Body.

Baltimore, Md.

ARTICLE II.

OUR NEIGHBORS—THE HEATHEN.

BY REV. GEORGE DRACH, D.D.

This is the second greatest commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." One of the men who heard Jesus say it, asked, "Who is my neighbor?" Others have since asked the same question. Indeed, many who profess to be Christians do not fully understand how far the obligation of Christian love extends.

Literally the word neighbor means the person who has been born and lives nearby. In ordinary conversation we speak of those as our neighbors who reside next door or in our immediate neighborhood. Yet space and distance are not the only factors to be considered in the Christian definition of the term. Christ has taught us that the need of our fellowmen, their physical and their spiritual need, should determine our attitude of loving service toward them. If we know that men are in need of our help, no matter where they may live, we are bound by the law of Christian love to do all we can to supply their need. From the Christian point of view, therefore, the neediest are the nearest to us.

Look around, look out into the world, look everywhere on earth, and when you have learned all the facts, tell me whom you find to be the neediest people in the world. Robert E. Speer, who has travelled all around the world many times and gone to unheard-of places, where white men are seldom seen, and who has just returned from a visit to the mission fields of the Presbyterian Church, declares that "The world with which we have to deal today and through whose shadows we have moved these past months is a hungry, weary and divided world. The compassion which our Lord felt for physical hunger when He was upon the earth would be deepened into anguish if he were abroad in the flesh among the nations today. There

are millions of men who have plenty and to spare, but there are millions more who hunger for daily bread and who suffer from sickness and pain." Dr. Speer then relates what poverty and distress he saw in Japan, China, India and Persia. "In India many millions of people live on one meal a day and never know what it is to have enough to eat. In America 50 per cent of the babies live to be 60; in India 50 per cent die before they are 10." In non-Christian lands the struggle for existence is hard and those who do work are practically slaves. This physical need of the heathen enlists our Christian sympathy and calls for the fulfillment of Christ's commandment to love our neighbors as ourselves.

In a certain sense, because of our personal missionary obligation, the people who inhabit our Lutheran mission fields in India, Japan, Liberia, British Guiana and Argentina, have a special claim on our benevolence. In India most of the people who are reached by the Gospel as it is preached and taught by our foreign missionaries and their native helpers, are wretchedly poor outcasts, earning four or five cents a day, with no prospects of improving their economic conditions except through the influence of Christianity.

HEATHEN WOMEN

Greater than the physical need of the heathen is their moral and social need. Have you no pity for the women of heathen lands? If you knew their sorrowful condition and how hopeless is their lot, you would do all you could to help them. Perhaps you do know and, therefore, do help, thus fulfilling the commandment.

"The hand that rocks the cradle rules the world," simply means that the condition of the women of any land more than any other thing influences the morality and social relations of the people as a whole. This is just as true of heathen as of Christian lands. Where Christian influences prevail women are respected and protected, and the moral and social ideals are high and

holy. Where heathenism prevails women are degraded and the social relations are immoral. In Liberia a man's wealth and standing in the community are judged by the number of wives, concubines and female slaves of his household. In Japan girls are sold for immoral purposes by their own parents. In India the value of a woman is estimated as less than that of a cow. Women in India are not educated but kept in ignorance of all life's highest interests and achievements. It is commonly believed that a woman has no soul and can reach the Hindu heaven only if her husband takes her there. It is said that the soul of a man may descend so low in the series of rebirths as to be reborn in the body of a snake or a snipe, but never so low as to be reborn in the form of a woman. Where such low estimates prevail you can readily imagine the degradation of the moral and social life of the people. The degradation of womanhood in heathenism accounts for the Indian zenana and the Mohammedan harem, for child-marriage and child-widowhood with their inevitable evils, for the established institutions of the *nautch* girls in India and the *geisha* girls of Japan, for all the social evils of non-Christian life, sanctioned by custom and religion, practiced by all classes. And nothing will change the distressing conditions, nothing will elevate the womanhood of heathen lands, nothing will sanctify the home-life, nothing will purify and ennable the moral and social relations except Christianity with its right moral laws and its holy social ideals.

IDOLS AND NO SALVATION

The greatest need of the heathen is their spiritual and religious need. They are heathen because they do not know the True God. They worship idols. Their gods are images made in the forms of men, women and children, animals, fish, birds, creeping things and things which have imaginary, grotesque, ludicrous and horrible forms. One of the most popular gods in India is Gan-

esha, who is represented as having the body and legs of a human being with four arms and the head of an elephant. More than three hundred and thirty millions of idols are worshipped in India. All non-Christian lands are filled with idols. In interior Africa fetishes are made of old teeth, odd stones, broken crockery and egg shells. Demon worship with its attendant fears and miseries characterizes every non-Christian religion.

You know the first commandment of the decalogue. Repeat it again at this point. The heathen do not know it and will never know it until Christian missionaries teach them. It is your Christian duty, therefore, in obedience to the commandment, to help to send out missionaries and to support their work.

The heathen do not know that there is salvation from sin and all evil through redemption by faith in Jesus Christ the crucified and risen Saviour. They do know that they commit sin and they feel and deplore the consequences of sin, but they cannot find the way of salvation, because they do not have the Bible and have never heard that God so loved the world that he gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believes on Him should not perish but have everlasting life.

In India there are many so-called holy men. Their lives, their thoughts, words and deeds are not holy and good, but they claim to be holy and are regarded as holy because they endure self-inflicted pain. Some of them lie naked on beds of sharpened spikes, others sit immovable looking into the sun thus courting blinded eyesight, others burn or cut their bodies in the most horrible manner. In these and other almost unbelievable ways they inflict pain and suffering upon themselves in the vain hope of securing release from the evil consequences of wicked lives. Some of us who are seriously minded would probably do the same things, if we were heathen. We do not do them because we are Christians who know One "bruised for our iniquities, by whose stripes we are healed." We look to the cross of Jesus Christ and find in

Him our righteousness and holiness. He takes away the sin of the world. We believe and sing:

"There is a fountain filled with blood
Drawn from Immanuel's veins,
And sinners plunged beneath that flood
Loose all their guilty stains."

If you know the need of the heathen for the saving Gospel of Jesus Christ, and have personally experienced redeeming grace, you will want them also to have this Gospel. Your opportunity to give it to them and thus to fulfill the commandment of love toward them, is to be found in the foreign missionary work of your Church. Some grasp the opportunity by becoming foreign missionaries. Others, unable to go abroad, do their share by contributing money. Part of the regular benevolent weekly contributions for the apportionment of the congregation is devoted to Foreign Missions. In addition you give directly for Foreign Missions by supporting your foreign mission pastor, who personally represents you in the foreign field, and by taking shares in the Foreign Mission Forward Fund. This fund is being raised by the Board of Foreign Missions to cancel its indebtedness of \$300,000 and to provide for imperative advance work in all our foreign fields. Those who take shares in it are helping in a real and effective manner to fulfill their obligations of loving service to the neediest human beings, the heathen, our neighbors in Christ Jesus, the Lover of souls, the Redeemer of the world, Whom to know, believe, love and serve is blessedness and eternal life.

Baltimore, Md.

ARTICLE III.

THE FREEDOM OF THE WILL*

(Augsburg Confession, Article XVIII)

BY L. FRANKLIN GRUBER, D.D., LL.D.

7 *Some Logical Inferences or deductions*

A AS TO THE ORIGIN OF EVIL

If the will, or the personality willing, is thus not subject to the causal law of the world-process, but is itself the cause of its decisions, however much it may be influenced by physical environment, then it must follow that in his primal choice of evil man alone was responsible. And his freedom must have been much more unhampered or complete in his primal state before he brought certain restrictions, especially as to spiritual things, upon himself. And although man was *created* no less than the environing universe, and is therefore not an uncaused being, the great Cause of his being is not the cause of his acts in the sense in which He is the cause of the operations of purely physical nature. Man was endowed in his creation with this very power of freedom as a new primary causal agent. It is a confusion of ideas to attribute man's acts, especially those of evil, to the Creator because He is the cause of man's being, for the creature is by creation made in this particular a new *creator*. To trace the cause of a personal act on the part of man to man's Creator, is to out-Adam Adam, for he at least did not go beyond Eve in placing the blame for his sin, even as Eve did not go beyond the serpent. Neither blamed it upon Him who created them with the power of free-

* Conclusion of Lecture on the Holman Foundation at the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., December 7, 1922.

dom. Nor did even the serpent attempt to fasten the blame on God.

It is true that, if neither man nor any other free personality had ever been created, there would never have been any moral evil in the universe, using the term *universe* even in the widest sense. But, then, neither would there have been any moral good on the part of a purely mechanistic creation. And to say that a Creator who could not have created a universe with morally free personalities that could not sin could not be omnipotent, would be to assert a palpable contradiction, for such a personality, one that could not sin, would not be morally free. To declare that such a Creator could not be omnipotent, would be demanding of Him the creation of a being with incompossible elements or attributes, which would imply an altogether unwarranted interpretation of the term *omnipotence*. And it would surely be a strange presumption of infinite knowledge, on the part of a finite creature, to hold that a Creator, who foreknew that such certain created personality would sin and who yet would create him, could not be morally good. But why even speak of foreknowing, for as already said, to Him there is no necessary before nor after in time, even as to Him there is no necessary before nor after in space. Surely all our attempts to attain ultimate truth by anthropomorphizing Deity must prove futile. We cannot read more into conclusions than we have in the premises. The key to the only possible solution of the problem of evil is thus found in created personality acting as a free agent. Nor would such a being in the least jeopardize the omnipotence or goodness of God.

B ANY THEORY OF MONISM UNTENABLE

As freedom can unquestionably have no place in any theory of monism as we have seen, and as it is nevertheless a fact that must be accounted for, the inescapable conclusion is that monism is untenable as an explanation of reality. Materialistic or Haeckelian monism is only

the extreme swinging of the pendulum away from the reality of the spiritual world, while Hegelian monism is the swinging of the pendulum to the opposite extreme. The one puts the whole emphasis upon the reality of the material world and the other puts it upon the spiritual. The one makes both man's mental and his physical states and acts the expression of physical law, the other makes them the expression of the philosophic abstraction of the Absolute; and according to both therefore all is reduced to necessity or is determined. And thus, in the light of what has been said, both are erroneous. But there are at least some elements of truth in both. There is so-called matter and also spirit, and so far as the physical universe is what is called material the latest science tends to make it a monistic reality, the so-called primary elements being undoubtedly of one primary substance.⁸ But that truth, in the light of the whole of reality even within the range of human experience and observation, not even to speak of the deliverances of consciousness as to man's own inner nature, is only a half truth. Not to speak of a creative Deity rationally demanded by the very existence of the physical universe as its necessary cause, a Deity therefore wholly different from the universe and therefore immaterial or spiritual, even in man we have the elements of matter and spirit that cannot be reconciled with monism. But these amply satisfy the demands of dualism. It is true that this extends the difficulty to the to us mysterious interaction between spirit and matter and to the consciousness of that interaction on the part of spirit. But at least this far we are on certain ground, that neither materialistic monism, which would explain mind or spirit in terms of matter, nor idealistic monism, which would explain matter as the projection of mind, nor even spiritualistic or spiritual monism, which reduces all to the Absolute, are adequate explanations of the universe we know. And according to none of these theories could there be freedom, of which we are, however, conscious and which is incon-

8 Ibid. Chapter VII.

trovertibly proved by the facts, as the invariable law of antecedent and consequent would reign upon the basis of any one of them. Nor can materialistic monism and spiritual monism be somehow united into a psycho-monism, for the same difficulty would confront us if we tried to read into such a mongrel philosophic theory the idea of freedom. But there is this ultimate truth in monism, that before creation God or spirit alone existed, and we are not so sure but that after physical creation will have subserved its purposes there may again be only that which is spiritual, God and created spiritual personalities.

C ADVOLUTION AND DEVOLUTION VERSUS CONSERVATION AND EVOLUTION

Now, as already pointed out, it is held by scientifico-philosophic determinists, that the law of conservation is absolute and universal, and that the whole of reality, in which there is a tendency to include even such Deity as by them may still be allowed, is therefore in process of evolution, or, in other words, is a *Becoming*, and that all the developments in the evolutionary process are only transformations by eternally operating resident forces. But it needs only to be pointed out that such a law of absolute and universal conservation would preclude the very possibility of at least such all-inclusive evolution. Surely, if that law were absolute the aggregate of all energy would be a fixed or constant quantity, and upon such a basis there could be no development in the aggregate. And if some previous necessary involution be resorted to to make the theory work, it would be in contradiction of the very contention that conservation is absolute and universal, for then at some time at least the law did not hold. And the exception once being allowed, the question of successive and perhaps continuous possible breaks in that law would be reopened all along the line. And thus the theory of absolute conservation and that of universal

evolution could at least not both be true. And, I may add, that an accumulation of evidence is more and more confirming me in my conviction that neither is universally true. I hold that it is not evolution coupled with conservation that constitutes the formula of the scientific world-process, but that it is advolution coupled with devolution. The former holds sway in the psychical realm and the latter in the physical. That the law of conservation is not absolute and universal, but is only relatively true with reference to a closed system, is more and more being believed by certain outstanding physicists. Indeed, some of the most eminent men of science are the most modest in their claims for that law. Recent investigations into the nature of matter and energy certainly seem to indicate that that great law can no longer be accepted unchallenged. As the mass and inertia of the constitutive electrons of so-called matter have been shown to vary with velocity and as mass is essentially electrical and therefore apparently identical with energy, both matter and energy (or rather matter or energy, or matter-energy) are variables.⁹ And thus the universe as a whole would undoubtedly come under that same category. And as is illustrated in the incessant disintegration of radioactive substances, a process believed to be universal in the so-called constitutive primary elements of what we call matter, the great law of the physical universe is expressed by the term devolution and not by the term evolution. And if it be contended that man's mental acts and states are only the result of electro-chemical action in the brain, then we should have a transmutation of physical energy into something hyperphysical or categorically wholly different, and therefore also in the loss of energy in the accepted meaning of that term. And, if men may still insist upon using the term evolution for what they believe to be indicated by certain phenomena, that evolution might then be regarded as only the throbbing of a local wave in the pulsations of what might some time after all end in quiescence, if not

⁹ Ibid. Chapter VII; also pp. 209-210.

in non-existence. But, on the other hand, in the associated psychical realm there is a very manifest aggregate development or enlargement, ever moving from high to higher. Thus successive generations come and go and leave to their successors the heritage of their lives and of their achievements with new, and in the aggregate ever greater potentialities and possibilities. And in the process the physical elements that are taken up and associated with the psychical are exalted and endowed, as though by a higher creative process, with new properties, even as in the recreation and reconstituting of that body in the resurrection we believe it will partake of still higher spiritual properties. Thus the process of devolution would be arrested and swept into the stream of that of advolution in so far as the physical would come within the range of the psychical. The lower would thus, as we should expect, be dominated by, and elevated by association into at least the borderlands of, the higher. And from the viewpoint of traducianism it might then quite appropriately be said of the creative process in generation that it

“A soul shall draw from out the vast
And strike its being into bounds,

And, moved thro’ life of lower phase,
Result in man, be born and think,
And act and love, a closer link
Betwixt us and the crowning race

Of those that, eye to eye, shall look
On knowledge; under whose command
Is Earth and Earth’s, and in their hand
Is nature like an open book;

No longer half-akin to brute,
For all we thought and loved and did,
And hoped, and suffered, is but seed
Of what in them is flower and fruit.”

Surely, in such a conception of God's *modus operandi* in His created cosmos there is abundant room for freedom of the will, for the doctrines of sin, election, regeneration and providence, as also there is for those of the passing away of the earth and the heavens that now are and of the coming of new heavens and a new earth, of the triumphing over or the supplanting of that which is natural by that which is spiritual.

Nor can such a view of the cosmos and of the continued creative processes be in the least in conflict with the marvelous outline story of the creation and of the fall of man, for man's perfection in creation must not be understood to have precluded the possibility of progress nor must it be confounded with a prospective relative completeness in the greater hereafter.

III *The Will Theologically Considered*

So far I have discussed natural freedom, a freedom which, if actually his, not only was man's before the fall but also to only perhaps a somewhat less degree is his still. I have set forth the two philosophical theories of the will called indeterminism and determinism, and trust I have at least partially succeeded in showing that the theory of determinism in either or all of its forms is untenable, or that the evidence is almost squarely on the side of indeterminism with the modifications pointed out. But there is another view that must now be considered. It is the theological doctrine of impotence as to *spiritual* things on the part of the unregenerate personality, as a consequence of the fall. Thus fallen man is held to be incapable of certain volitions pertaining to the spiritual life and the spiritual world. According to determinism the so-called volitions would be determined by environment and antecedent states of mind, or by the causal law of physical nature, even as also supposedly would then have been the case before the fall. But this theory has nothing directly to do with the doctrine of such spiritual impotence since the fall. Much confusion has

arisen in certain quarters from a confounding of these two, as if man's spiritual impotence were the same as philosophic determinism. It seems to be a question as to man's spiritual ability or inability perhaps more than one of free will that has been the subject especially of the older theologians.

In the Christian conception man by creation belongs to two different realms, a fact involved even in what I have already said, and which is clearly taught or implied in numerous passages of Scripture, such, for example, as the account of Christ's conversation with Nicodemus and certain very striking statements in the epistles of St. Paul. Man is *in* the world of nature, but in his spiritual self he is *not of* that world. His present life is rooted in the natural, but it is to be attuned to the spiritual. But in his spiritual nature he is not what he might or ought to be, a fact that is confirmed by conscience and human history. He has been enslaved by sin, so that, unless he is born again a new and free creature in Christ Jesus he cannot rise above his fallen self and be righteous. To set forth this fact is more particularly the purpose of this Article of our great Confession.

Before I enter upon this more purely theological consideration of this Article it is important to make some preliminary explanations. A distinction has been made between man's will, theologically considered, before the fall, after the fall in his unregenerate state, after regeneration, and after the resurrection of the body. With man's will before the fall, after regeneration, and after the resurrection of the body, this part of the Article under consideration has nothing directly to do. It is concerned with the will or ability of man in things spiritual after the fall but before he is brought under the regenerating grace of the Holy Spirit. It has to do with what I shall, for the sake of clearness in discussion, call the question of *spiritual freedom*, whether there still remains to unregenerate man the freedom of the will as to *spiritual* things.

In the discussion of the philosophic aspect of the will, I distinguished between what I called psycho-physical freedom and psychological or psychical freedom and showed that, with certain limitations, man is free in both senses and that the former freedom is included in the latter. I shall now distinguish between *psychological freedom* and what I am calling *spiritual freedom*. According to the conception of psychological freedom I have so far set forth, it belongs to man in his natural state, to his life in this world and in his association with his fellowmen. But by spiritual freedom I mean to express the freedom or ability of man with respect to the spiritual kingdom.

1 *The Confessions on the Will in Things Spiritual*

After setting forth man's ability of working civil righteousness, our Confessors at Augsburg express themselves as to the impotence of man in spiritual things in the following words: "But [they teach] that it [the will] hath no power to work the righteousness of God, or a spiritual righteousness, without the Spirit of God; because that the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: 1 Cor. 2:14. But this is wrought in the heart when men do receive the Spirit of God through the word."

And in order that we may have Melanchthon's own explanation of this point, also generally accepted by the Church, we refer to the Apology (Article XVIII). After developing the point concerning the freedom of the will in working outward righteousness, he proceeds as follows: "But it is false that the man does not sin, who performs the works of the commandments without grace... For human hearts without the Holy Ghost are without the fear of God; without trust toward God, they do not believe that they are hearkened to, forgiven, benefited, and preserved by God. Therefore they are godless. For 'neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit' (Matt.

7: 18). And ‘without faith it is impossible to please God’ (Heb. 11: 6).’

“Therefore, although we concede to free will the liberty and power to perform the outward works of the law, yet to the free will we do not ascribe these spiritual matters, viz., truly to fear God, truly to believe God, truly to be confident and hold that God regards us, hearkens to us, forgives us, etc. These are the true works of the First Table, which the heart cannot render without the Holy Ghost, as Paul says (1 Cor. 2: 14) : ‘The natural man,’ i.e. man using only natural strength, ‘receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God.’”

This is in perfect accord with Luther’s matchless explanation of the Ten Commandments, in which he makes all obedience flow from the fear and love of God, so that it is not a mere obedience to a “Thou shalt not,” but an obedience that rises from that *negative* obedience to possible works of love, as for instance in his explanation of the fifth commandment, “We should so fear and love God as not to do our neighbor any bodily harm or injury, but rather assist and comfort him in danger and want.”

To continue the main thread of this argument, in Luther’s wonderful explanation of the Third Article of the Creed we have these words on man’s spiritual impotence: “I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ my Lord, or come to Him; but the Holy Ghost has called me through the gospel, enlightened me by His gifts, and sanctified and preserved me in the true faith,” etc. And this spiritual impotence of man likewise underlies the petitions of the Lord’s Prayer, and is implied in Luther’s explanation of them, as, for instance, in the First Petition, “Hallowed be thy name,” of which he says, “The name of God is indeed holy in itself; but we pray in this petition that it may be hallowed also by us.” And so in Luther’s explanation of the sacraments every spiritual good is attributed to God alone, for the edifying reception of which the heart is prepared by the Holy Ghost. So in his elaborate explanation of the Third Article of the Creed, in the Large Catechism,

he says, among other things, "For neither you nor I could even know anything of Christ, or believe on Him and have Him for our Lord, except as it is offered to us and granted to our hearts by the Holy Ghost through the preaching of the gospel. The work is finished and accomplished; for Christ, by His sufferings, death, resurrection, etc., has acquired and gained the treasure for us. But if the work remained concealed, so that no one knew of it, then it were in vain and lost. That this treasure therefore might not lie buried, but be appropriated and enjoyed, God has caused the Word to go forth and be proclaimed, in which He gives the Holy Ghost to bring this treasure home and apply it to us. Therefore sanctification is nothing else than bringing us to Christ to receive this good, to which, of ourselves, we could not attain."

Thus not only is the treasure *provided* by God in Christ, but also we are *brought* to that treasure in Christ through the Holy Ghost. The whole work of regeneration and sanctification is represented as God's work, nor can man contribute any of the spiritual elements.

But to these citations, from the Confessors, on man's total spiritual impotence we must add the testimony of the second generation of Reformers, as set forth in the Formula of Concord. In Chapter II of the First Part or Epitome, we find these words: "Concerning this subject, our doctrine, faith and confession is, that, in spiritual things, the understanding and reason of man are (altogether, blind, and, from their own powers, understand nothing... Likewise we believe, teach and confess that the will of unregenerate man is not only turned away from God, but also has become an enemy of God, so that it has inclination and desire for that which is evil and contrary to God... Yea, as unable as a dead body is to quicken and restore itself to bodily, earthly life, just so unable is man, who by sin is spiritually dead, to raise himself to spiritual life... Yet God the Holy Ghost effects conversion, not without means; but uses for this purpose the preaching and hearing of God's Word..."

For without His grace, and if He do not grant the increase, our willing and running, our planting, sowing and watering, all are nothing, as Christ says (John 15: 5) : 'Without me, ye can do nothing.' In these short words He denies to the free will all power, and ascribes everything to God's grace, in order that no one may boast before God: 1 Cor. 1: 29."

And in the Second Part, or the Solid Declaration, Chapter II, we find the following: "Namely, that in spiritual and divine things the intellect, heart and will of the unregenerate man cannot, in any way, by their own natural powers, understand, believe, accept, think, will, begin, effect, do, work or concur in working anything, but they are entirely dead to good, and corrupt; so that in man's nature, since the fall, there is, before regeneration, not the least spark of spiritual power remaining still present, by which, of himself, he can prepare himself for God's grace, or accept the offered grace, or, for and of himself, be capable of it, or apply or accommodate himself thereto, or by his own powers, be able of himself, as of himself, to aid, do, work or concur in working anything for his conversion either entirely, or in half, or in even the least or most inconsiderable part, but he is the servant (and slave) of sin (John 8: 34; Eph. 2: 2; 2 Tim. 2: 26). Hence the natural free will, according to its perverted disposition and nature, is strong and active only with respect to what is displeasing and contrary to God."

2 *The Testimony of Scripture*

Let us now see whether this teaching of our Confessors is logically and Scripturally tenable. In that wonderful account of the fall of man, however much of it may even be regarded as figurative, great truths are involved in every sentence. When man was placed into Eden, the Lord said, "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Gen. 2: 16-17). There was freedom, freedom to eat of all the

trees, and even of the so-called forbidden tree. But the penalty for eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was the loss of that freedom in death, and that death was to follow in the day of the eating. And upon the fall man was driven out of Eden and deprived of the ability of eating also of the tree of life and thus to live forever, while at the gate God placed the Cherubim and the flame of a sword to keep the way of that tree of life. His ability in spiritual matters, as we might express it, was thus totally taken away. But, then, what shall we understand by spiritual things? For a definition I shall quote Quenstedt as probably quite acceptably expressing the meaning attached to that expression by the Church. He says: "By spiritual things we mean such emotions and actions as are prescribed by the Law and the Gospel, and can be produced only by the motion and action of the Spirit of God, so that they are the true knowledge of God according to the measure of written revelation, detestation of sin committed, or sorrow for sins, the fear of God, faith in Christ, the new obedience, the love of God and of our neighbor."

A MAN DECLARED SPIRITUALLY DEAD

The spiritual impotence involved in the story of the fall of man, is confirmed in the New Testament. Thus St. Paul writes of the Ephesians as having been dead in trespasses and sins (Eph. 2: 15), as also he speaks of the Colossians as having been dead through trespasses and the uncircumcision of their flesh (Col. 2: 13). So likewise in the parable of the prodigal son, the prodigal is represented as having been dead (Luke 15: 24, 32). And thus even by implication it is evident that there is no ability in spiritual things left to the unregenerate or spiritually dead soul. As a corpse is powerless in the physical realm, so is a spiritually dead soul in the spiritual realm. Indeed, such a spiritually dead soul is wholly outside the realm of the spiritual kingdom and therefore has no capacities for exercise in it. It is this fact that

Jesus so strikingly asserts in his conversation with Nicodemus, in which he declares, "Except one be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God... Except one be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (John 3: 3-6). It is the ignoring of this great spiritual truth that has caused so much confusion and misunderstanding as to the doctrine of man's impotence. Indeed, without the light of this truth a correct understanding of this subject is impossible.

B HIS UNDERSTANDING SAID TO BE DARKENED

Because the natural man is outside the spiritual kingdom and therefore without spiritual powers, or is spiritually dead, it must logically follow that he cannot unaided by the Holy Spirit understand God's revelation of Himself and His gracious promises. And this we find to be the clear teaching of Scripture. Thus St. Paul says, "Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged" (1 Cor. 2: 14). This is also set forth in the words immediately preceding: "We speak God's wisdom in a mystery, even the wisdom that hath been hidden, which God foreordained before the worlds unto our glory: which none of the rulers of this world hath known... For who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him? even so the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God. But we received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is from God; that we might know the things that were freely given us of God. Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth; combining spiritual things with spiritual words" (1 Cor. 2:7-13). So also he speaks of the Gentiles, as "being darkened in their understanding, alienated from the life of God, be-

cause of the ignorance that is in them, because of the hardening of their heart" (Eph. 4:18). Other similar passages are Matthew 11:27 and 1 Corinthians 12:3. The same is expressed in the further words to the Ephesians, "Ye were once darkness, but are now light in the Lord" (Eph. 5:8). So also in the wonderful introduction to his Gospel, St. John says, "In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness apprehended it not... There was the true light, even the light which lighteth every man coming into the world" (John 1:5-8).

It is because of this fact of darkness, darkness of the understanding, that the ascended and glorified Lord in calling Paul to the apostleship commissioned him to go to the Gentiles, "to open their eyes, that they may turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God" (Acts 26:18). And this truth of man's inability to know God and Jesus Christ whom He has sent, is re-echoed by St. Paul in such words as these, "For the word of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us who are saved it is the power of God...Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of the world? For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe" (1 Cor. 1:18-21). Thus the wisdom of this world cannot include the deep things of the spiritual life and the spiritual world. It belongs to a lower order, by its very nature, than the wisdom of God. Hence God's method of redemption is to the worldly wise (Greeks) a stumbling block and unto the Gentiles foolishness (1 Cor. 1:23-25). Therefore St. Paul would know nothing among the Corinthians save Christ Jesus and Him crucified. And yet he says, "We speak wisdom, however, among them that are fullgrown: yet a wisdom not of this world, nor of the rulers of this world, who are coming to nought: but we speak God's wisdom in a mystery, even the wisdom that hath been hidden, which God fore-

ordained before the worlds unto our glory" (1 Cor. 2: 6-7).

C FAITH DECLARED TO BE THE GIFT OF GOD

For the same logical reason as that on account of which the natural man cannot understand God's revelation and the things of the spiritual kingdom, it must also follow that he cannot *believe* that revelation and rise by faith to God. Thus the power to appropriate redemption, no less than the provision of that redemption, must be the work of God. And with this conclusion corresponds the teaching of Scripture, which represents faith as itself wrought in us by the Holy Spirit. Thus St. Paul says, "By grace have ye been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God" (Eph. 2: 8). And he says to the Philippians, "To you it hath been granted in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer on his behalf" (Phil. 1: 29). And the Saviour Himself says, "This is the work of God that ye believe on him whom he hath sent" (John 6: 29). Thus even faith or belief in Christ is the gift of God. Hence this fact also that man's salvation is wholly the work of God, testified to man's spiritual impotence.

D ABILITY TO DO GOOD IN SPIRITUAL THINGS ASCRIBED TO GOD

With the inability to understand and to believe the things of the spiritual kingdom, the revelation of God's will and of His love, must necessarily be associated man's inability to do what is spiritually good. And this also is confirmed by Scripture. St. Paul says: "They that are after the flesh mind the things of the flesh... For the mind of the flesh is death... because the mind of the flesh is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can it be: and they that are in the flesh cannot please God" (Rom. 8: 5-8). Again he says: "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit

against the flesh; for these are contrary the one to the other; that ye may not do the things that ye would" (Gal. 5: 17). Many other passages might be cited, such as Psalm 14: 1-3; 53: 1-3; Romans 3: 9-12; 7: 14-25, to indicate that this is the unmistakable tenor of the teaching of Scripture generally.

And this fact of man's inability to do good in spiritual matters is also emphasized in the many passages in which all ability to do good is ascribed to God. St. Paul declares, "And such confidence have we through Christ to God-ward: not that we are sufficient of ourselves, to account anything as from ourselves; but our sufficiency is from God" (2 Cor. 3: 4-5). And he says also to the Philippians, "It is God who worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure" (Phil. 2: 13), and that "he who began a good work in you will perfect it until the day of Jesus Christ" (Phil. 1: 6). Indeed, Jesus Himself declares, "He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit: for apart from me ye can do nothing" (John 15: 5).

E MAN'S SPIRITUAL IMPOTENCE CALLED A BONDAGE

In perfect consistency with its teaching as to man's inability with reference to spiritual things, to understand, believe and do, Scripture sets forth his impotence under the figure of *bondage*. Thus Jesus says: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.. Every one that committeth sin is the bondservant of sin" (John 8: 32-34). And St. Paul speaks of the old man as being crucified with Christ, "that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin" (Rom. 6: 6). And there is a continual struggle for full emancipation even on the part of the regenerate, as St. Paul says, "For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I know not: for not what I would, that do I practice; but what I hate, that I do" (Rom. 7: 14-15). And, once more, "I delight in the law of God after the inward man:

but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my members. Wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death" (Rom. 7: 22-24). Strong words from the noble apostle Paul!

F SUMMARY OF SCRIPTURAL TESTIMONY

Thus when the sentence of death was pronounced upon man it went into immediate effect in the spiritual death that has reigned over unregenerate mankind ever since. Freedom in spiritual things was lost with the divine image. And in that spiritual death darkness of the understanding has reigned. Nor can the natural man rise in faith to God, or do what is spiritually good. Man became the servant of sin, and, as history and experience also testify, he is under the power of evil. He is indeed still able to do good in external matters, as our Confessors acknowledge; but, without a new heart and sanctified will, such outward goodness profiteth nothing. Of this we have a remarkable confirmation in the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, as for instance in the verse, "And if I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and if I give my body to be burned, but have not love, it profiteth me nothing." Unless the outward deed is prompted by something higher than mere desire to benefit, namely, by an impulse of love as the result of the regenerating grace of the love of God, it is an outward deed only. Nor does it have any justifying merit before God. So a Pharisaic blameless keeping of the letter of the commandments, such as was even that of St. Paul before his conversion, is not righteousness such as is exemplified by a keeping of the spirit of the commandments out of the fear and love of God because of His love to us in Christ Jesus. The rich young ruler's mere outward keeping of the commandments did not afford him an entrance into the kingdom of God, even as a person might acknowledge certain great doctrines of the Bible as intellectually tenable and yet be far from the Kingdom.

Thus a distinction must be made between moral or natural goodness, that is, goodness only because of its good effects, and spiritual goodness because of its source in the regenerated heart and the sanctified will.

G POWER OF EVIL LEFT TO UNREGENERATE MAN

Apart from that ability or freedom to choose or do what is morally or naturally good, there is of course also the freedom left to choose or do what is *evil*. Thus we still have power to reject the Gospel grace. This is implied in Christ's lament over Jerusalem, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" (Matt. 23: 37). Thus amidst spiritual death there is the possibility of continued *activity* in trespasses and sins, "Wherein," St. Paul said to the Ephesians, "ye once walked according to the course of this world." And of such general walking in trespasses and sins by deliberate choice, on the part of the natural man, the Old Testament and the history of the heathen world, not to speak of those in Christian lands, bear abundant witness.

Indeed, freedom or ability to choose and do evil is implied in the very idea of *sin*. For, without the voluntary element, sin would not be sin. Hence it follows that, in a real sense, the will is both free and not free, free or able to choose evil but not to choose spiritual good. In other words, the soul has certain powers pertaining to that which is evil which it does not have with reference to that which is good. It may be said that the liberty or power to do evil goes with the soul's freedom or ability as to natural or external things, even including merely natural *goodness*. And as neither of these two pertains to this world of man in his fallen state, they may well be associated as belonging under the same category with man's natural freedom or ability. And there is perhaps an intimation of the recognition of this association in the extreme position of some theologians who regarded even

moral goodness as nothing but evil. And to this conclusion it would be but a short step from its classification with evil under the same freedom or ability.

Indeed, this association of outward righteousness with liberty or ability as to the doing of evil, appears confirmed also in passages in which both seem to be implied. Thus Jehovah said to Cain, "If thou doest well, shall it not be lifted up? and if thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door" (Gen. 4: 7). And He said to Israel, "See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil" (Deut. 30: 15). The same is implied in many other passages, especially those of exhortation to Israel, in which the Old Testament abounds. Thus also St. Paul exhorts the Romans, "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey the lusts thereof" (Rom. 6: 12). And, for that matter, even in man's regenerate state he has this twofold freedom, as is possibly involved in the verse just quoted, but as is more definitely set forth in what follows: "Neither present your members unto sin as instruments of unrighteousness; but present yourselves unto God, as alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God. For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under lew, but under grace" (Rom. 6: 13-14).

3 Distinction Between Freedom and Ability

The various points in the Scriptural testimony which I have set forth have to do with the ability, or rather inability, of unregenerate man, no less than with the freedom of the will, or rather want of freedom. Indeed, in a sense, the latter may be said to be involved in the former. And although I have so far treated these two together, because ordinarily the distinction might not be imperative for our purpose, yet, I believe that I should at least call attention to the distinction between them.

Though in many instances, both in the natural and in the spiritual realm, they no doubt in effect coincide, there are many instances in which freedom to will does

not imply ability to perform, or in which inability to do need not involve want of freedom to will in that particular. From what I have said it is seen that the term *freedom of the will*, in the restricted sense, should not be confounded with *freedom of the agent*. Nor must ability of the will be confounded with ability of the agent to act. It seems that in some of the earlier ecclesiastical controversies there was some confusion on this point, the terms being often used interchangeably as if they were *absolutely* synonymous or meant *exactly* the same thing. Thus, although Augustine is generally spoken of as if his discussion had to do with the subject of freedom as such, yet it apparently had to do more with ability, or rather inability, of the person than with freedom of the will in the modern sense, as also to some extent had the famous discussions of the Reformation period.

I have already pointed out that, as the will is an essential faculty of man, as much as is his intellect, he must retain it in his fallen state, however weakened it may be and however unreliable because of his darkened understanding. But, of course, one cannot will concerning that of which he does not know. And, indeed, to speak of the will as not free is to speak of it as not *will*. It is this perhaps more than anything else that constitutes man a rational personality. And, for that matter, reason must necessarily have associated with it the faculty of will nor can either exist without the other. Hence man's will is still free from compulsion from without. This fact has been recognized by some of our most eminent theologians, and is involved even in our Article. But, as is shown by the phraseology, our Confessions generally treat of freedom and ability together. Upon a close examination of the wording of Scripture it is seen that it is, quite frequently, the inability of man that is set forth. Thus in his exclusion from Eden the former occupants were deprived of their ability to eat of the tree of life. And Christ says, "Apart from me ye can do nothing" (John 15: 5).

4 Is Any One Predestinated to be Lost?

The total inability of man in helping to effect his own salvation, and in general his inability as to things spiritual, naturally involves the much debated question of predestination. For, if two equally lost sinners both receive the same Gospel and the one is saved and the other is not, there must apparently be a cause somewhere for this difference of destiny. If both are equally spiritually impotent it at first thought seems quite plausible that the cause of this difference cannot be in the person himself. Hence the conclusion has been drawn that this cause must be in God, by whose supposed arbitrary omnipotence the one is saved and the other is not. And as the Gospel grace has been arranged for from eternity before the actual creation of man, some theologians like Calvin have contended that all men, even including Adam and Eve, before the fall, were predestinated in the eternal counsels of God; and these have therefore been called prelapsarians. Thus some have supposedly been foreordained to be saved and others have been foreordained to be lost.

Others like Augustine have held that this predestination includes only the descendants of Adam and Eve, or those after the fall; and these have therefore been called postlapsarians. It was this view apparently that Luther held in his earlier days. It deeply depressed him during his monastery life, as at times he firmly believed that he was one of those predestinated to be lost. But from this depression he was delivered as from the dead by new light and hope which gradually came to him from the Gospel of the Love of God. From Augustine he gradually turned to Paul, according to whom predestination is not absolute or unconditional, but conditioned upon God's foreknowledge: "Whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son...and whom he foreordained, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified" (Rom. 8:29-30). It is thus held

by our Church that there is a predestination only in the case of the saved, but not in that of the lost. They are lost, not because of any decree on the part of God, but on account of their own wilful rejection of the offered grace and their resistance of the Holy Spirit.

For, as we have already seen, freedom or ability to reject God's grace and resist the Holy Spirit, still remains to unregenerate man. In addition to the passage of Christ's lamentation over Jerusalem, the power to resist the Spirit was set forth by Stephen in the words, "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit: as your fathers did, so do ye" (Acts 7: 51). And St. Paul exhorts even the Ephesians, who were presumably Christians, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, in whom ye were sealed unto the day of redemption" (Eph. 4: 30), as also he does the Thessalonians, "Quench not the Spirit" (1 Thess. 5: 19). It is thus seen that the freedom or power of resisting the Spirit continues even in the regenerate.

That God is not the cause that some to whom the Gospel call comes and with whom the Spirit pleads are lost, is also evident from the fact that they were already lost before that call and pleading. It is thus not that they were lost because of a supposedly ineffective call on the part of God, but that they were *not saved* and so continued in their lost condition because they *refused* to be saved. And, that man might remain a free moral agent, he is not compelled to accept God's offer, to believe and be saved.

But, then, as even faith is itself the work of the Spirit of God, as we have seen, would it not follow that therefore the want of faith in some and thus their rejection by God, is the work of God? By no means, for, as already stressed, man has freedom and ability to resist the Spirit, and therefore this very gift which the Spirit would, and indeed alone can, impart. Thus the lost are themselves the cause of their *continued* lost condition, although there is a sense in which by permitting them God may truly be said to rule in and overrule all the

acts of man, as it is written, "O Jehovah, I know that the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps" (Jer. 10: 23). But this concurring Providence and this direction of man are not such as to unmake man as a rational and voluntary responsible agent, or such as to make God the cause of personal deeds and misdeeds, nor must they be pressed as an argument for unconditional or absolute predestination by the sovereignty of Almighty God. Hence St. Paul says truly, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God who worketh in you both to will and to work, for his good pleasure" (Phil. 2: 12-13). And yet He does not do so for that which is evil, and of course not in the rejection of the offered grace and in the despising of the Spirit of God. The doctrine of man's free agency is therefore not in conflict with that of God's sovereignty. Man wills and acts and God rules in and through his actions. This expresses the relation of man's freedom to God's omnipotence. And only when man's will is fully attuned to the truth and will of God can it be said to be spiritually free, as Jesus said, "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8: 32).

5 *Is there any Cooperation in His Regeneration on the Part of the Individual?*

Several of the Points made naturally suggest the question as to the extent, if any, to which unregenerate man may be said to cooperate in his regeneration. And, although this point may be considered as covered already, because it has been a storm-center in more than one theological controversy and because it is of vital importance to a clear understanding of the subject, I shall add a word to what I may already have said bearing upon it.

As the lost are by their own negative attitude the whole cause of their *continued* lost condition and therefore of their final condemnation, it would at first thought

seem plausible that the will of the saved must also be a factor in cooperating with the Holy Spirit in their regeneration and salvation by its very non-resistance. It was this suggestion that apparently caused Melanchthon later on to regard the will as a factor in the appropriation of grace and salvation.

It is true that the regenerated cooperate with the Holy Spirit in the bringing forth of the fruits of righteousness. But this is not true of the unregenerate, except in so far as their attitude or act when the Gospel comes to them is an expression of freedom or ability such as is manifested with reference to things external. For, in its last analysis, such attitude or act with reference to the externally offered Gospel is of the nature of an attitude or act as to things external. Hence it follows that the will of man, in what I have called *spiritual* freedom, is not an active factor in the Spirit's work of regeneration through the Word, a work that is necessarily *spiritual*. There is thus no Scriptural nor logical ground for synergism, as there is no spiritual cooperation of the soul with divine grace in the work of salvation.

I have now developed the fact somewhat at length that, within certain limitations, man is free with respect to the kingdom of nature. I have presented the teaching of the Reformers as to the natural man's impotence in spiritual things and have shown that their position is in full harmony with the unmistakable testimony of the Word of God. I have pointed out, moreover, that this view is wholly in accord with a true psychology and with consistent reason. Nor is this theological doctrine of man's spiritual impotence or spiritual bondage found, upon thorough thought and study, to be at all in conflict with the philosophical doctrine of his natural freedom. And thus what this Article XVIII of our great Confession so unequivocally sets forth, we may still acknowledge as *our* confession on the much debated subject as to the freedom of the human will.

St. Paul, Minn.

ARTICLE IV.

THEORIES CONCERNING THE PERSON
OF CHRIST

BY A. E. DEITZ, D.D.

It is the purpose of this article to discuss certain theories concerning the person of Christ, especially those theories that have to do with the relation between the divine and human natures of our Lord during His State of Humiliation.

It is admitted by all that the constitution of our Lord's Person presents one of the profoundest mysteries in the whole range of theological study,—a mystery that will never be fully searched out by the intellect of man. Even the keen insight of the ablest and most spiritual Christian theologian must acknowledge that there are depths here which have never been sounded and never will be sounded. After all our study we can only exclaim with St. Paul, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past tracing out!" Rom. 11: 33.

Yet there is a strange fascination about this mystery of the Person of Christ and the devout mind turns to it again and again in meditation and prayer, seeking to know as much of the truth as may be known and thankful for any insight or illumination that may be granted, however limited it may be. From the earliest days of Christianity men have pondered over this mystery and the Church has set forth her beliefs concerning the essential truths involved, giving them large place in her creeds, impelled thereto by the necessity of guarding against error and misconception.

The mystery has to do with the manner in which the Divine and human natures in Christ were brought together in one Person. How were the infinite and the

finite united? This mystery we purpose to consider here in a limited way, dealing only with the question as to the relation between the divine and human natures of Christ during His State of Humiliation. Thus our problem has to do with the God-man and the two sides of His being during His life on earth.

There are three attributes belonging to the divine nature of Christ which have been the subject of endless discussion in this connection. They are the attributes of omnipotence, omniscience and omnipresence. All these attributes belonged to Christ as God and they shine out to some extent in His teaching and life. But, on the other hand, Christ was man and He is pictured in the Gospels as sharing in the limitations of normal human nature. He was weak and at times displayed that weakness, He was weary and needed rest. And at last "He was crucified through weakness." II Cor. 13: 4. He was limited in knowledge. He grew in wisdom as well as in stature and passed through all the stages of human development from infancy and childhood on up to youth and maturity. He declared His own ignorance as to the day of His second advent. He was present in some one place and was not in other places. "I am glad for your sakes that I was not there." John 11: 15. Thus, running through the Gospels, there are two sets of apparently contradictory facts and the problem that grows out of them is the question how the divine nature of Christ which in itself was omnipotent and omniscient and omnipresent was united in the same person with a human nature which in itself was limited in power and knowledge and in its relation to space.

Many and various are the theories which have been offered as a solution or a partial solution of this problem. Some of them are weak and worthless. Even the best of them may be but more or less accurate approximations to the truth. It is hardly to be expected that the divine facts in this mysterious realm shall be fully comprehended by the human mind or be adequately set forth in the language of earth. Nevertheless, so far as the Scrip-

tures throw light upon our path, it is safe to go forward with reverent and confident tread. In considering and weighing the various Christological theories, it is desirable that we should keep constantly in mind the limits within which the truth actually lies. These limits have been clearly fixed for us by the teaching of the Scriptures. The Bible teaches that Christ was truly God. The Bible teaches that Christ was truly man. The Bible teaches further that Christ was not two persons but only one person. This teaching of the Bible is so clear and explicit that the Church has gladly confessed it in her creeds and the Lutheran Church above all has clung to it most tenaciously and will continue to hold and confess it without wavering. Within the limits thus definitely fixed for us, the truth concerning the Person of Christ undoubtedly lies. By these limits it is possible to test the various Christological theories. No theory can be accepted which destroys or weakens the integrity of our Lord's divine nature on the one hand or the integrity of His human nature on the other hand. And, more, no theory can be accepted which destroys the unity of our Lord's Person. By these criteria, we may judge all proffered solutions of the Christological problem. Some very plausible theories go to pieces when judged in this way. But the real deity of Christ and His real humanity together with the unity of His Person are the essential facts in this connection and it would be better to discard all theories and to hold fast to these facts in simple faith without any attempt to reason out their connection in a logical way rather than to accept some theory that ignores or distorts these facts and robs them of their true significance and power.

From this standpoint, it is clear that the kenotic theory of our Lord's Person must be rejected. This theory in some form has found wide favor and acceptance. It supposes that the divine and the human in our Lord's Person were brought together by an actual reduction of the divine, the Logos laying aside His divine attributes at the Incarnation. Such a theory may guard

the unity of Christ's Person and make Him truly human but it robs Him of His essential deity and must therefore be rejected.

One of the most remarkable and striking theories of modern times in the realm of Christology is that advanced by Dr. Sanday, the noted Oxford scholar. His views are set forth with great learning in his work on "Christology and Personality." He holds that "the proper seat or *locus* of the Deity of the incarnate Christ" is the "subliminal consciousness," or the sub-conscious part of His being.

Dr. Sanday writes, "On the one hand, we think of the human consciousness of the Lord as entirely human; we make no attempt to divide it up and fence off one part of it as human and another part as divine. Whatever there was of divine in Him, on its way to outward expression whether in speech or act, passed through, and could not but pass through, the restricting and restraining medium of human consciousness. This consciousness was, as it were, the narrow neck through which alone the divine could come to expression. This involves that only so much of the divine could be expressed as was capable of expression within the forms of humanity. We accept this conclusion unreservedly, and have no wish to tamper with it. The Life of our Lord, so far as it was visible, was a strictly human life; he was, as the Creeds teach, 'very man'; there is nothing to prevent us from speaking of this human life of His just as we should speak of the life of one of ourselves. Over this we can shake hands with those continental theologians who insist on taking the humanity of our Lord in real earnest, and as no mere matter of form. But, on the other hand, we no less emphatically refuse to rule out or ignore or explain away the evidence which the Gospels and the rest of the New Testament afford that this human life was, in its deepest roots, directly continuous with the life of God Himself." See *Christology and Personality*, Page 167.

This whole theory of Dr. Sanday's is modeled as he

himself states on a supposed analogy between the mode of the presence or indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the heart of the Christian and the mode of the presence of the Logos in Christ. This brings out at once a fundamental weakness in Dr. Sanday's position. His Christ after all is not the God-man but only a man in whom the Logos or God dwells. His view makes no distinction between the way in which God was present in Christ and the way in which God or the Spirit or Christ was present, let us say, in St. Paul, who could say, "It is no longer I that live but Christ liveth in me." Gal. 2:20. Dr. Sanday's theory does not give us a real union of the divine and human natures of Christ in one Person and for this reason as well as for its unsatisfactory character in other respects it can not be regarded as acceptable.

We turn now to consider the Christological views of our Lutheran theologians, and especially, of some of our Lutheran theologians in America. Some of them in their works have simply reproduced the teaching of The Formula of Concord, Chapter VIII, on the Person of Christ, without any special discussion of the problems which the Christological thinking of a later age has brought to the front. Others have devoted some attention to these problems.

Dr. Valentine in his *Christian Theology*, Vol. II, discusses at length the Person of Christ and the State of Humiliation. One or two quotations from these chapters will serve to bring out the points in his teaching which are of special interest. He says, "In the solution of the problem of the growth and progressive development of the Person who was the incarnate Son of God, a divine-human Person, true God-man from infancy to His full Godmanhood, we are justly and fully entitled to think of the eternal Son in becoming the Redeemer and accomplishing the earthly stage of the work, as renouncing, in measure, the *exercise*, the *use*, of the divine prerogatives and powers in His possession. For this self-reserve, this *non-use* of the divine attributes and powers belonging to Him, is seen to be but a reflection and illustration

of a divine possibility and reality of freedom that belongs forever to the very conception of God." See Pages 82 and 83. Again he says, "The preexistent Son, Logos, Word, was the subject of the humiliation or self-emptying." See Page 90. According to Dr. Valentine, then, in the Incarnation the Logos or divine nature of Christ voluntarily laid aside in measure the use or exercise of His divine attributes. He still possessed His divine attributes but during the State of Humiliation He did not use them, except in a limited way. This would make room for the human weakness and ignorance and growth of Jesus but the explanation in itself is not altogether satisfactory.

Dr. Valentine argues for his view on the ground that God Himself uses His eternal attributes or powers in freedom, under a principle of self control, making a greater or less use of them according to His own will. "We dare not think of Him as always doing all He can do, as creating all the worlds or creatures He can, or as evermore exhausting the potencies of His attributes." "In short, it is normal to our conception of God to think of Him as exercising His eternal powers under a principle of self-reservation, using them or not using them in self-determining freedom." The conclusion drawn from this is that we are justified in thinking of the Logos as laying aside or limiting the use of His divine attributes during His earthly life since this is practically the same thing that God is constantly doing.

This argument is far from convincing. Whatever may be true of God's omnipotence, it is not true of certain other attributes as omniscience and omnipresence, that "it is normal to our conception of God" to think of Him as using or not using them at will. Omniscience is the *actual knowing* of all things. Back of that of course lies the divine *power or ability* to know all but we do not think of God as using or not using that power or using it in a limited way at different times. Rather do we think of Him as always using His power to know all and using it to the full at all times. If then we suppose that the

Logos in the Incarnation stepped down to a state in which He used His power to know all in a limited or partial way, we can not argue for this supposition on the ground that God does the same thing, for God does not do anything of the kind. This holds true of God's omnipresence as well. Dr. Valentine's argument would apply only to the attribute of omnipotence.

But there is positive objection to Dr. Valentine's theory, and that, too, with reference to this very attribute of omnipotence. The Scriptures teach us concerning Christ that "all things have been created through Him and unto Him; and He is before all things and in Him all things consist." Col. 1:16 and 17. In Heb. 1:3, Christ is spoken of as "upholding all things by the word of His power." These passages give us a view of Christ upholding and governing all things. Are we to suppose that He laid aside these divine activities during His earthly life? Did the second Person of the Trinity withdraw for the time being from a share in the work of God in upholding and governing the world? Dr. Valentine's theory requires us to think this. But in that case what becomes of the unity of the Holy Trinity? The very unity of the Godhead forbids us to adopt the theory here under discussion.

Dr. Lindberg's Christological views are set forth at length in his recent book on *Christian Dogmatics*. As will be seen from the quotation following, he differs widely from the author we have just been studying. We quote from his chapter on The Two States of Christ. "Self-renunciation has reference only to the human nature. We must therefore draw the conclusion that in accordance with His divine nature He (i.e. Christ) exercised the prerogatives of the divine majesty during the period of His self-renunciation. The conception of the absolute personality, which implies that God is triune, makes it clearly manifest that two of the persons could not perform the divine works independent of the third. To be sure, this is a peculiar condition, especially when we consider the implications of *unio personalis*, viz.,

that Christ as one person in accordance with the one (divine) participated in the divine activity, while in accordance with the other nature He did not so participate. On the other hand, it certainly would be an inexplicable situation if one of the persons in the divine being would for a considerable period renounce the exercise or even the possession of the divine attributes, inasmuch as such a change would create a disturbance in the life and activity of the divine being. In such a case there would have been a period when God would have ceased to be triune, or as two persons would have exercised the internal and external activity of the Godhead, especially the latter. Such a position militates just as much against the doctrine of the divine essence as the Lutheran doctrine of self-renunciation seems to conflict with the doctrine of *unio personalis*, and that wherever Christ is, there He is entire. In a choice between different views from the point of view of the Christian reason, it is evident that the Lutheran doctrine of self-renunciation is the most acceptable, for it does not encounter as many difficulties as a theory that extends the self-renunciation of Christ much further. The objection has been made to the general Lutheran position that it implies a duality in His person, in so far that in accordance with the one side of His person He is omniscient, while in accordance with the other side He has renounced that exercise of this attribute. He is both omniscient and He is not omniscient. Even if it can not be satisfactorily explained, the assertion that the divine nature has renounced omniscience and the other attributes is just as inexplicable, if not more so. We must therefore assume that Christ, according to His divine nature, knew all things, but as He, according to His human nature, became conscious of the possession of the divine attributes, so He also according to the same nature renounced the exercise of omniscience, etc." See *Christian Dogmatics*, Page 231 f.

One great merit of Dr. Lindberg's discussion is the candid way in which he faces the difficulties and objections even to his own view. He sees clearly what those

difficulties are and points out in the paragraph quoted what is, perhaps, the greatest weakness in our whole system of Lutheran dogmatics as ordinarily presented. We begin by insisting strongly on the unity of our Lord's Person. Then after exalting His human nature by our doctrine of *Communicatio Idiomatum* we bring it back again practically within the limits of a normal human nature by our doctrine of self-renunciation as ordinarily set forth and so in the end we have really a divided Christ,—a Christ, whose divine nature and human nature each carry on certain activities of their own apart from one another. Thus we break up the unity of our Lord's Person which we so stoutly maintained at the beginning. We shall inquire presently whether or not this method of procedure can be improved upon so as to avoid the inconsistency noted, but what concerns us just now is that Dr. Lindberg's discussion clearly reveals the weakness of the traditional Lutheran view which he himself accepts.

In the paragraph following the one already quoted, Dr. Lindberg makes some observations which are interesting and helpful even though they do not remedy the weakness referred to. He says, "In order to get some idea of how Jesus Christ could be omniscient according to His divine nature and according to His human nature know only as a man, we may use some analogies or illustrations. The human mind of Christ during exinanition stood somewhat in the same relation to Logos or the divine nature as a prophet to the Holy Spirit, except that the divine and human natures of Christ constituted one person. The prophet would not know more of the future than the Spirit revealed. If the divine nature had continually allowed the human nature to use omniscience and all-wisdom, Jesus could not have developed as a child and grown in knowledge and wisdom. Sometimes we cannot recall things we know, but in another minute we may remember them. In the same way our subconscious mind knows things which our conscious mind is ignorant of. Sometimes in awakening from sleep the subcon-

scious mind has the connection and we know things that we otherwise would never know. In Christ the divine nature or Logos was always present, but did not always become manifest and work through the human nature. The sun is often dimmed by the clouds. When Christ said that concerning the time of the last day no one knew except the Father, He still knew it according to the divine nature, but could not disclose through the human nature by the ordinary channels why it was as if unknown according to the human consciousness. But now, in the state of exaltation He knows it also according to the human nature." See *Christian Dogmatics*, Page 232f.

Dr. Lindberg's explanation and suggestions are worth remembering even if they do not really solve the fundamental problem involved. They do not show us how the two natures in Christ can really be joined together in one Person when they are continually functioning apart from each other.

We turn now to look at the view of Dr. Voigt as presented in his *Biblical Dogmatics*. He writes, "The word 'assumed' is in important respects a suitable word for the incarnation, yet it is inadequate. One may assume a dress, an office, a form of life, which may be dropped again. Here we have personal and enduring union. The conception of assumption, applied to the personal union in Christ, still leaves room for dualistic ideas. Indeed it suggests the conception of a lower human life and a higher divine life hovering over it with its penetrating influences. To overcome this dualism in the conception of the personal union and to lay hold of the idea of a unified person, it is necessary to define the idea of assumption further so as to remove every element of mere besideness of the divine and human natures and of separation between them. In homely phrase it may be said, they are all in each other. The acts of Christ cannot be referred separately to the human and divine natures. All, however human the manifestation of the action or however divine it may appear, all is personal and theanthropic. Behind this interpenetration in

action lies the interpenetration in existence. The divine and the human natures exist in unity in Christ. They do not merely coincide in a limited circle, outside of which the person has life that is only human, and again in boundless sweep life that is only divine. Incidentally let it be remarked that the characteristic features of Luther's christology is his insistence upon the perfect unity of the life of Christ. In this lies his advance upon earlier christology. He sang: 'He whom the world could not inwrap yonder lies in Mary's lap; He is become an infant small, who by His might upholdeth all.' See Biblical Dogmatics, Page 100f.

Again, in arguing for the unity of Christ's consciousness, Dr. Voigt writes, "The coincidence of the human consciousness with the divine is not a double consciousness, but a unified consciousness. It is one selfhood. The consciousness of Christ was one, but the mental states of Christ were not always one and the same. Jesus slept and then His mind was not awake. So we need not be surprised that He professed ignorance in regard to a fact, Mk. 13: 32. But when it was necessary for Jesus to know, Jesus always knew without being informed by man; for in His personality were infinite depths.

"Therefore we fully recognize a true human development in Christ, but always in the unity of a theanthropic consciousness. In infancy the thoughts were those of a babe, in youth the thoughts of a youth, in manhood the thoughts of a man, and in glory after the resurrection the thoughts of the Son of man in glory. The circle of thinking, willing and acting widens with the growth of Christ from the manger to the throne at the right hand of God; but in all stages the human thoughts rest upon the infinite bosom of the eternal thoughts of the Son of God and vibrate in unison with them." See Biblical Dogmatics, Page 103f.

From the quotations given, it is clear that Dr. Voigt like Luther himself emphasizes strongly the unity of Christ's Person and he makes an earnest effort so carry

out this idea in his whole discussion. In some measure, too, he is successful. We believe that he is right in holding to the unity of Christ's consciousness. Still unity of person is not really and fully attained after all so long as the human thoughts and the divine thoughts can be distinguished from each other in the consciousness of Jesus in the way Dr. Voigt suggests in the last quotation given above. And if the divine thoughts are actually present in the consciousness of Jesus, how could He be ignorant of anything? Unless, indeed, we are ready to say that when Jesus declared His ignorance of a certain fact, He was speaking as a man, or speaking from the standpoint of His human nature. But this mode of expression, Dr. Voigt himself rejects as unsatisfactory and misleading.

Our review of Christological theories in this article shows how difficult it is to frame any theory concerning the Person of Christ that is really satisfactory. We have to deal with facts apparently irreconcilable, facts before which all theories seem to break down. Nevertheless, we venture to offer here certain suggestions looking toward the construction of a Christological theory that may perhaps commend itself by reason of its recognition of the real unity of our Lord's Person while at the same time it does justice to the integrity of each of His two natures. These suggestions are offered in a tentative way for the whole long history of Christological discussion urges caution in the effort to systematize the facts in this mysterious realm.

First, the unity of Christ's Person should be firmly maintained. That means unity of consciousness, unity of thinking, unity of life. Everything that Jesus thinks or says or does, He thinks or says or does as the God-man. This was basic in Luther's Christology and it grows out of the whole Biblical representation of our Lord and His work. Nothing is to be thought of as purely divine. Nothing is to be thought of as purely human. But everything is divine-human. Only so can we maintain the reality of a divine-human Saviour.

Second, we should frankly recognize the sub-conscious element in the constitution and life of Jesus. Only a part of the soul's activities come within the range of a man's consciousness. The soul consciously thinks and feels and wills but at the same time it carries on similar activities in the hidden realm of the sub-conscious. We have seen the use which Dr. Sanday makes of the sub-conscious in his theory of the Person of Christ and we have found his theory unsatisfactory. Nevertheless, we may and ought to recognize a sub-conscious element in the experience of Christ. It is a part of the constitution of every man and so we should expect to find it in the constitution of Jesus. Moreover we know that Jesus slept and that fact alone goes far to prove the position here taken.

Third, the conscious and the sub-conscious activities of Jesus alike were divine-human activities, the conscious activities being limited in range while the sub-conscious activities were unlimited and infinite. We ought not to talk of the "human consciousness" of Jesus or of His "human thoughts." In everything that He thinks or knows or wills He acts as the God-man. Only the thinking and knowing and feeling of the God-man fall into two parts as ours also do, according as they come within the range of the consciousness or fall below or outside of that range. Further, the conscious activities of the God-man as His thinking and knowing, e.g. were limited in range while His sub-conscious thinking and knowing, etc. were infinite.

Fourth, the conscious activities of the God-man should be regarded as beginning in a very small way in his infancy and gradually growing wider and wider in range, keeping step with the growth of His human body and soul, until at last when His State of Humiliation ends and the State of Exaltation sets in the sub-conscious element disappears entirely and His conscious activities become unlimited. Meantime, even during His State of Humiliation, we may believe that it was possible for Him to draw at will on the stores hidden away in the depths

of His sub-conscious being just as we ourselves do when we make a successful effort to remember something that we desire to recall. So Jesus draws out any fact at will from the infinite riches of the subconscious realm within Him.

It is evident that on the basis of the suggestions given above it is possible to construct a full Christological theory. Such a theory will rest back on the Lutheran doctrine of the *Communicatio Idiomatum*. It will make the self-renunciation of Jesus at the time of His incarnation refer not to the divine nature alone nor to the human nature alone but to the God-man in the unity of His Person and it will make that self-renunciation to consist in this, that the God-man voluntarily accepts, for the period of His earthly life, certain limitations in the conscious exercise of the divine attributes which belong to Him, meantime exercising those attributes to the full in a sub-conscious way.

The advantages of this view concerning the Person of Christ are obvious. It enables us to hold fast to the reality of both the divinity and the humanity of Christ and at the same time to see the two natures in Him joined together in perfect and most wonderful unity. It shows how Christ could be "upholding all things by the word of His power" even when He was an infant and even when He was dying on the cross. It shows how Jesus could know anything He desired to know and yet might be ignorant of any particular fact if such a fact had never come within the range of His consciousness and if for reasons of His own He chose not to call it up out of the realm of His sub-conscious knowledge. It gives us a Teacher whose conscious knowledge, indeed, is limited but whose conscious knowledge nevertheless is absolutely certain and correct for it is the God-man who knows these things. It gives us a Saviour who dies, and who goes through the whole terrible experience that we call death in the unity of His divine-human Person.

The view here presented in this tentative way may,

perhaps, leave us with some difficulties still in our thinking. It does not do away with all the mystery surrounding our Lord's Person but it does give us some help in the attempt to formulate a Scriptural and consistent Christological theory and so it has much to commend it to our acceptance.

*The Hartwick Seminary,
Hartwick Seminary, N. Y.*

ARTICLE V.

THE THEORY OF MORAL OBLIGATION.

BY PROF. JACOB M. HANTZ, D.D., LL.D.

If the study of Moral Philosophy were now established for the first time among the branches of knowledge cultivated in our institutions of learning, it might be thought necessary to offer some observations at length in favor of a science the object of which is in general imperfectly understood, and the pursuit of which is considered by many of doubtful value, and by a few absolutely pernicious. But to enter upon such a defense before an educated public must be superfluous; their judgment will enable them to separate the legitimate use of knowledge from the abuse of it; and they have improved this discrimination itself by the study of that moral philosophy which superficial minds are apt to view with so much apprehension. There are many thinkers in our country and in Europe who have studied the ancient writers on ethics with diligence and success; and though the maxim of Lord Bacon, "Antiquitas saeculi juventus mundi," be true in its application to the physical sciences, which are continually advancing to perfection by the accumulated stores gathered in each succeeding age, the remark is not just when extended to the moral sciences; since the latter can derive no new principles from our more accurate investigation of the external world. In our study of the ancient writers indeed it is by no means necessary to disregard the modern; both should be investigated, to supply their mutual deficiencies, and to illustrate each other. It is only by comparing the main principles of Aristotle, Plato, and Epicurus, and the systems that grew out of them, with the opinions of Des Cartes and his followers, with the doctrines of Hobbes, with those of Locke and his opponents, that we can expect to establish upon any solid basis the philosophy of the human mind. But if we are compelled to choose between them, and to decide which

ought to have the preference as text-books in a system of education, those who are best acquainted with their respective merits will have no hesitation in assigning the first rank to the ancients. If the moderns have shown more ingenuity in examining the faculties of man, in tracing the association of ideas, and explaining the phenomena of our mental constitution, the Grecian philosophers are beyond all comparison their superiors in comprehensiveness of design, in beauty of style, and closeness of reasoning: and it should not be forgotten, that some of the most recent modern systems, which set up high claims to originality, have been borrowed without acknowledgment from the writers of antiquity.

But there are some, perhaps, who will inquire, to what purpose is it that such a subject as *moral philosophy* is pursued at all? Are not Christians, they all ask, already possessed of an inspired code of duty, to which they are bound to yield implicit obedience? Now, if we take the lowest sense of the terms, and consider *moral philosophy* synonymous with mere ethics, and employed only in furnishing a course of practical rules for the conduct of life the objection which has just been stated rests upon no solid grounds. It is founded upon an incorrect and mistaken view of Christian morality, and argues at the same time an imperfect acquaintance with the proper sphere and just value of other ethical systems. The principles and precepts of the Gospel transcendentally perfect as they are, cannot supersede the necessity of judicious instruction, as to their correct application. Being general and comprehensive, they are adapted to all the varying scenes of human conduct; but the time and mode and circumstance of their adaption is to be pointed out, otherwise their utility as practical principles would sometimes be lost altogether, from not being understood at all and very frequently be deprived of half their value from being understood imperfectly. The most essential rules are indeed plain and obvious to the conceptions of all, and the uneducated peasant has ideas upon some questions as clear as the most enlightened philosopher. "Nulli praeclusa virtus est; omnibus patet, omnes admittit, omnes

invitat. *Ingenuos, libertinos, servos, reges.*" Yet how many points are there of duty incumbent upon the man and the Christian, in which the ordinary understanding needs instruction in applying the letter of his religious code! Are such admonitions as many of those contained in the popular works of Paley and Ferguson to be thrown aside, because we possess an inspired law of imperative authority; when the very exhortations contained in them are given in reference and in subserviency to that revealed system of morality, whose paramount obligation we all equally profess to reverence? To deliver such precepts is not to be considered as an attempt presumptuously to set aside by human contrivance the claims of the divine law, but rather humbly to offer up the first fruits of human labor and intelligence upon the altar of the supreme Legislator, in order that God may have the honor which belongs to Him alone, and man have all the benefits and the privileges which his perfect ordinances were designed to produce. The laws of Relation are not made vain in consequence, but they are explained, established, supported; made to bear, as they were intended, upon the minutest points of human conduct, and brought home to us as a salutary and efficient rule of life. Nor is the moralist confined to the task of pointing out the application of Christian precept: he may prove to many who are inclined to cavil at the restrictions which religion imposes, and to set up in opposition to them the law of honor and of public opinion, how reasonable these religious obligations are, how indispensable to the welfare of individuals and communities. If Christianity inculcates forgiveness of injuries, and teaches that marriage is honorable, the man of the world who will candidly sit down to examine the discussions of Paley on these subjects, will be compelled to confess, that contrary principles which he has sometimes extolled as praiseworthy, or extenuated as pardonable, are opposed to the impulses of our best affections, and to the peace and happiness of society.

Such are the practical lessons which may be derived from the study of moral questions. But *Moral Philoso-*

phy must not be confounded as it has been in Paley's definition, with ethics, properly so called, or with casuistry: its province is of a higher order, its subject matter more comprehensive: it is not merely to furnish admonitions and exhortations to duty, nor to solve difficult questions of rare occurrence: if it be entitled to the name of philosophy, and to take its place among the sciences; it must search after principles; it must ascend to the source of duty and obligation; it must examine the nature of man, and analyze his mental faculties; and must lay the foundation of morals in the phenomena of mind. In a word, its business is to teach men their obligations, and the reasons and principles of them: as these obligations branch out into the duties of citizens no less than individuals, it comprehends political science along with ethics, properly so called: as they have their origin and root in the feelings and affections of our intellectual nature, it is closely and inseparably connected with mental philosophy.

Moral Philosophy then, in its widest sense, comprehends all those subjects which are most interesting and important to the welfare of individuals and communities. It teaches man the knowledge of himself and the laws of his intellectual existence; the proper development of his faculties with a view to their present improvement and final perfection. Physical sciences have their value, contributing as they do to increase our knowledge of visible and external things; to multiply our comforts and advance civilization: physical powers are but the servants of the moral powers, and without the control of the latter would become only instruments of evil. If we could suppose the fortunes of a community committed to the uncontrolled will of a tyrant who should realize in his monstrous depravity the appalling picture of tyranny which Plato has delineated,¹ or if we could imagine the whole mechanism of the physical universe wielded by some all-powerful but malevolent being, for the sole purpose of tormenting mankind, it would be impossible to conceive misery more intense, or reflect upon

¹ De Republica, lib. ix.

existence under such a state of things without a feeling of aversion and horror. When we cherish the hope of happiness, we confide in the moral attributes of the Deity and the moral qualities of our own nature, which he has given and commanded us to improve, and whose future destiny he has appointed. Difficulties may press around us at every step in the investigation of such subjects as moral philosophy presents; we may be continually baffled in our expectation; but the truth though partially, will not be entirely concealed, and the imperfect knowledge we gain will amply reward the labor employed;² and, like the alchemists in their search after gold, even if we fail of success, we shall meet with many valuable discoveries by the way, to be employed for the benefit of ourselves and others. Inquiries of this kind, if properly conducted, impart strength, acuteness, and elevation to the understanding beyond any other studies whatever: and the man who has been trained at an early period of life in this source of mental cultivation will be sensible of its advantageous effects in every branch of investigation, whether practical or speculative, to which he may subsequently devote himself. The graces of poetry and eloquence may be necessary to adorn the temple of knowledge, but its foundation and its pillars must be erected on that capacity for solid thought which moral and political sciences are best calculated to create and mature. And considered in this view, without reference to any direct consequences, they have been well compared "to the crops which are raised, not for the sake of the harvest, but to be ploughed in as dressing to the land."

Having made these few observations on the advantages to be derived from the study of Moral Philosophy and the comprehensiveness of its subject matter, I shall proceed at present to what appears a preliminary and necessary step in the discussion of such a subject, viz., an inquiry into the source of moral obligation, or the basis on which it rests: a question which has given rise to much differ-

² Mad. de Staél, tom. iv. chap. I, de l'Allemagne.

ence of opinion both in ancient and modern times and which, intimately connected as it is with the origin of our ideas and the responsibility of our actions, involves the most important consequences. The inferences which the French writers deduced from the doctrines of Locke,—or rather from a mistaken view of his doctrines—have tended to sap the foundations of morality; and amid many wild and extravagant speculations of the German philosophers it ought not to be forgotten, that the labors of Kant and some of his followers (whatever absurdities and extravagances they may have fallen into) have been nobly and honorably employed in combating principles which confounded the distinctions of right and wrong.

The principal theories that have been adopted respecting the first source of moral obligation are the following:

1. Some with Wollaston and Clarke make it consist in the "eternal fitness of things."
2. Others with Plato and Cudworth in certain immutable distinctions which the understanding of itself perceives.
3. Hutchinson imagined the existence of a moral internal sense.
4. The generality of writers place the ultimate obligation of morality in the will of God.
5. Bishop Butler in the law and benevolent tendencies of our nature.
6. Paley in the expediency of the action to promote the general happiness of mankind.
7. Protagoras, Polus, and the ancient sophists mentioned by Plato, Gassendi, Hobbes, Helvetius, and many others, have taken a lower view, and maintain that its only foundation is the conventional law of the country, and where that law is silent, there is no longer any distinction between right and wrong, and the agent is at full liberty to indulge his own inclinations, either in the pursuit of pleasure or personal interest.

It is obvious that these theories, though enumerated singly and separately, are by no means, with the exception of the last, altogether unconnected and independent of each other, and that scarcely any of them (the same

exception, borne in mind) are without some show of reason on their side. Had it been otherwise, it would have been hardly possible that they should have been adopted in the first instance by men so distinguished both for virtue and intellectual sagacity as many of their respective supporters.

The view of Wollaston and Clarke, who speak of the eternal relations or fitness of things, does not exclude the notion of obedience to the will of God.

Nor is the opinion of Bishop Butler, who asserts that morality has its origin in the law and tendencies of our nature, irreconcilable with the theories of Wollaston³ or those of Plato and Cudworth.

And even the hypothesis which makes expediency the source of moral duty, (using the term *expediency* in that enlarged sense which Paley has assigned to it, as synonymous with the general happiness of mankind in all ages and countries) does not annihilate the distinction of right and wrong, or annul the obligation of obeying the will of God, and cultivating the benevolent feelings and affections which he has bestowed.

The wrong opinions contain some elements and partial glimpses of what is right; but in this inquiry, as in discussions of other subjects, effects have been often confounded with causes: and it will be most desirable, if possible, to ascertain the truth; because a mistaken principle (harmless in itself, if rightly understood) is frequently appealed to by men inferior in moral worth to those who first adopted it, and is made a justification of consequences, both in theory and practice, which they never contemplated.

Without examining in detail the opinions just enumerated, it will be sufficient to confine ourselves to two ques-

³ The fact is, Wollaston and Clarke expressly mention in their discussion the obligations of the law of nature: Wollaston's theory is, that moral good and evil are immutable, because there is a relation of things settled and fixed by nature; to speak and act in conformity to this relation is truth, therefore moral and right; to violate this conformity is falsehood, therefore immoral and wrong. Wollaston. Religion of Nature, sect. 1, *passim*. See also Clarke's first sermon on the Being and Attributes of God; and Grotius' Prolegomena to his Treatise *De Jure Belli et Pacis*.

tions which arise out of them, and which are the main points to be considered in an inquiry respecting moral obligation.

1. Whether there are any fixed principles and notions of morality introduced into the understanding or heart of man antecedent to the lessons derived from experience and observation, in regard to the salutary effects of a certain class of actions.

2. Or whether all our ideas respecting virtue and vice were derived originally from perceiving the different consequences to society arising out of different modes of conduct.

In some recent philosophical systems these points of consideration have been mixed up to an unnecessary extent, with disputes concerning the doctrine of innate ideas and metaphysical arguments upon the freedom or dependence of the understanding.⁴ It has been assumed that those who deny the innateness of ideas, must also deny liberty to the intellect, and the existence of immutable morality. German writers seem to consider the three questions as inseparable, and talk of the glorious inconsistency of those who, maintaining Locke's principle as to the origin of our ideas, refuse to accept the consequences to which it inevitably leads. In order therefore to establish upon its proper basis the eternal and unchangeable nature of morality, they have thought it necessary to revive the doctrine of innate ideas, in the strictest sense of the term, without which they may conceive man's understanding, must be the servant of his sensations, and the distinctions of virtue and vice an empty name. They do not indeed profess to hold that morality is directly and immediately innate, nor will they allow that they maintain the doctrine of innate ideas at all: they assert that they believe in the existence of innate faculties, the development of which is subject to certain rules; a truth against which no solid objection can be urged: but they go further; they assert also that there

4. This freedom ought to be assumed, not proved. Wollaston, pp. 7-8.

are certain primary forms of thought antecedent to all experience, and in no way derived from it: now if these are not merely faculties giving birth to notions, but distinct and positive conceptions, yet prior to experience, we do not change the nature of the theory by a change of the sign: whether we choose to call them *imperatives*, *imperative forms*, or *primitive intuitions*, it is very difficult to conceive any difference in the thing signified by these terms, and the meaning conveyed by the more common phrase *innate ideas*. As such obscurity and confusion of thought have arisen from an inaccurate use of language, some mistakes on the subject will perhaps disappear, if the signification in which the term *innate* and the term *idea* are intended to be applied be properly established in the first instance.

The word *idea* is applied by Locks in a very vague and indefinite manner; sometimes he appears to use it as synonymous with images impressed upon the mind from external objects; at other times he applies it to all notions of the soul whatever. In the former application of the word, ideas must necessarily be dependent upon sensation; in the latter not so. At present it may be sufficient to observe, that I shall use *idea* for all the notions and sentiments of the soul, in whatever manner and from whatever cause they first take their rise.

Again, if by the term *innate* he means something born with man, impressed upon his mind when he first comes into the world, antecedent to his acquaintance through the medium of the senses with external objects, or, with any external circumstances whatever; few philosophers, unless bewildered by the subtlety of their own speculations, will acquiesce in a theory which implies such a supposition. Our notions of time and space which are considered by Kant as examples of these primary creations of mind, by no means warrant the inference; the idea of time seems manifestly subsequent in order to other ideas, the succession of which it measures; and the idea of space can hardly be derived from any other source than our sensible acquaintance with the external world. It is perfectly true, that all our conceptions are compelled by the

necessary laws of the understanding, to arise and develop themselves in reference to these forms of thought, but it does not follow that they are *innate*. But if by *innate* be meant something *natural* to man, so interwoven into the whole constitution of his faculties, that no power of external objects, or contingency of circumstances can prevent the ideas from developing themselves, there is little reason to doubt that there are certain principles and conceptions thus inseparable from the lot of our existence. If a solitary savage be found cut off from his birth from all communication with the rest of his species, he cannot be without the notions to which we give the name of time and space: whatever ideas he may want, these will inevitably suggest themselves. Take man in the lowest and most degraded condition of *social* life, some moral ideas will as certainly be developed; the caprice of arbitrary institutions and customs will never prevent the sentiment from arising in his breast that he ought to do what he thinks right, and avoid what he thinks wrong, and that intention constitutes the criminality of an act; nor will they stifle the conviction, that it is his duty to feel gratitude and goodness to his friends and benefactors. The lonely savage we have alluded to cannot possibly have these convictions, because they are relative, and imply the intercourse of men living in connection with other men; but in society, which is⁵ natural to man, they will naturally arise under every modification of it. The story, therefore, which Paley tells of the boy Aveyron, and whom he introduces as a proof that there is no inherent and original distinction between right and wrong, is idle and inapplicable. He triumphantly supposes that the boy, when he heard the tale recounted of the black ingratitude of a child to a father, would not have understood the criminality of the son: without question he would not; for he could not have understood the paternal relation, or any other duties which grow out of the social state. He could not pronounce upon the quality of the action, for he could have

5 Aristotle, Politic, lib. i.

no idea of the action at all. You might as well ask a blind man to determine the distinction of color, or a deaf man the properties of sound. In searching after the ultimate obligation of morality, we must not, therefore, appeal to the example of an individual brought up without fellowship with his race among the brutes of the forest; but to the character of men in domestic or civil union. And under the circumstances of such a union, no instance can be produced where some correct and unchangeable notions of relative duties have not been found; a fact which can only reasonably be accounted for by referring it to the law of our nature; to the course which our affections and faculties cannot avoid taking in that condition of life for which the Creator intended us. It is therefore no just conclusion, that if ideas are not innate, the foundations of morality are overthrown: it is no necessary consequence, that if the precepts of truth and justice have not been engraven⁶ by the finger of God on the tablet of man's heart, they depend altogether upon convention and external circumstances; and that moral principles must themselves change with the contingencies with which we are surrounded. The Deity who has given a law to the whole created universe, has given a law also to that assemblage of affections and faculties which make up our mental constitution: he has assigned them their ranks of superiority and subordination: he has appointed reason as the sovereign, and fixed the limits where the waves of passion are to be stayed. He has made it necessary that the sense of truth and right should arise in the human breast; and free as we are to choose the right or the wrong, we cannot annihilate the difference between them: nor can we dethrone conscience from her tribunal, who is appointed to inspire the sentiment of approbation or disapprobation according as the better principles

6 Writers, even philosophical writers, often express themselves so vaguely upon this subject that it is difficult to grasp their exact meaning: take, for example, the following sentence from the works of the eminent Professor Stewart, "Even the great principles of morality, although implanted in every heart, are commonly aided and cherished, at least to a certain degree, by the care of our instructors." Elements of Philosophy, col. i, p. 30.

of our nature have been observed or violated. If there had been no written revelation of God's will to man, the law of his own nature would have been of itself a revelation of morality as it was so in fact before the Mosaic code was given: if there had been no menace denounced by inspired enactment against the infringer of morality, the inspiration of conscience itself would have inflicted punishment on those who were disobedient to their parents, or bore false witness against their neighbors. Neither the moral ordinances of Moses, nor the more perfect ordinances of Christ, created the principles or transformed things in themselves indifferent, into positive duties: they embodied obligations before existing, in brief rules and precepts, and gave a sanction to them by direct authority from Heaven, for the sake of guarding them more securely, and diffusing their influence more extensively. A new check was thus offered to the violence of passion, which was too apt to overstep its proper limits, and at the same time a guide and criterion was afforded, by which in all cases our actions might safely be tried, and to which our doubts and deliberations might be referred. There have been examples of monsters in the physical world: the nature of man has sometimes been perverted, unjust distinctions of right and wrong set up, and a false conscience has passed a corrupt judgment upon the actions performed; but the cases are not numerous either in nations or individuals, compared with the general course of human opinions. When we see a crippled limb and an unsound state of body, we do not infer that crippled limbs and an unhealthy constitution are according to the order of nature, and the intentions of Providence. Morality then, it may safely be asserted, is the law of man's nature, and the source of it must be sought in the will of the Deity who made him: but when we speak of the will of the Deity, be it remembered that we speak of a Being whose will cannot be capriciously exercised, but which is the same with his essence. Nor can we conceive Him without impiety to have created us with different sentiments

respecting justice, or benevolence, or gratitude, than those which we possess. We cannot conceive it possible that God should have willed *evil* to be *good*, or *good* to be *evil*, or fraud to put on the beauty and sanctity of truth. In this view morality may be said, and truly said, to be eternal and unchangeable even by the will of the Deity Himself, because it is connected with and inseparable from all our notions of his attributes; and unless we can alter these notions, we cannot alter our ideas respecting morality and immorality or destroy the distinctions on which they rest. And if it be lawful without irreverence to inquire further, and the question be asked, why it is that the Divine Being has made morality natural to man; the answer has been already anticipated—on account of His own attribute of goodness: because He desired the happiness of the whole creation; because He knew that this law would be necessary to human happiness in the present social condition, and, for aught we can understand, might have still further and more comprehensive objects to promote, which we cannot penetrate. The tendency of morality to produce happiness is certain and infallible; but this tendency is the property of it rather than the essence: it does not constitute it, but necessarily flows from it. I should therefore define morality, considered as an internal quality in ourselves, to be “an obedience to the law and constitution of man’s nature, assigned him by the Deity, in conformity to his own essential and unchangeable attributes, the effect of which is the general happiness of his creatures.”

It is a strong argument in favor of the correctness of this definition, that it accords in its main features with the moral theories adopted by the most profound thinkers, both of ancient and modern times. It was the chief principle of that old philosophy which enlightened and adorned the best age of Grecian learning; the study of

which Bishop Berkeley⁷ no mean judge on such subjects warmly recommended in preference to more recent and shallow speculations, and which the investigations of such men as Butler and Cudworth have served to illustrate and confirm. Whatever differences existed between Plato and Aristotle, respecting the origin of ideas, and indeed many minor points in their moral systems, they both held, in opposition to the sophists, the immutable distinctions of right and wrong: they both held, that it was the proper business of life so to train up the good and evil tendencies implanted in us, as to make the evil obedient to the good, according to the law of our natural constitution, by which the understanding is appointed to govern, and the affections to submit. Aristotle asserted as well as Locke, and almost in the same words, that man's soul came into the world γραμματεῖον & μηδὲν υπάρχει, ⁸ a tablet upon which nothing was engraven; but he did not maintain in consequence that the understanding was the passive instrument of sensation, or that right and wrong were the arbitrary creations of custom and supposed expediency. This statement has indeed been sometimes doubted and denied, even by men well informed on the writings of antiquity. Barbeyrac, the learned translator and commentator on Puffendorff, goes so far as to censure the Grecian philosopher, because he has not founded right and wrong on fixed and inherent distinctions, but made them the creatures of conviction

7 It might very well be thought serious, trifling, to tell my readers, that the greatest men had ever a high esteem for Plato; whose writings are the touchstone of a hasty and shallow mind, whose philosophy has been the admiration of ages; which supplied patriots, magistrates, and lawgivers, to the most flourishing states, as well as fathers to the Church, and doctors to the schools. Albeit in these days, the depths of that old learning are rarely fathomed, and yet it were happy for these lands if our young nobility and gentry, instead of modern maxims, would imbibe the notions of the great men of antiquity. But in these free-thinking times, many an empty head is shook at Aristotle and Plato, as well as the Holy Scriptures. And the writings of those celebrated ancients are by most men treated on a foot with the dry and barbarous lucubrations of the schoolmen." Siris in Berkeley's Works, vol. ii, p. 613.

8 De Anima, lib. iii, chap. 5.

and civil enactment. But how far would this assertion of Barbeyrac's⁹ accord with passages which we continually meet with? It is laid down as a principle in the third book of the *Ethics to Nicomachus*,¹⁰ that when the virtuous man chooses what is intrinsically and truly good; the vicious man, on the contrary, what is really bad. To the same purpose we may appeal to the divisions of political justice, in the fifth book of that treatise,¹¹ where the origin of it is referred partly to natural, partly to legal distinctions: and the result of the discussion, in which the disputed point is examined, leaves an impression upon every attentive reader, that Aristotle himself believed in the existence of natural and unchangeable principles of right, which, though frequently perverted by our own selfish interests and passions, could never be destroyed: or we might ask, what is his theory of equity,¹² but a return, when written laws have accidentally deviated from them, to those eternal principles of justice, from which legal ordinances, in the first instance, derived all their origin and authority. Many other passages both in this treatise, and also in the *Rhetoric*,¹³ and his other works, might be referred to; but it would be an endless waste of time and labor, to allude to the subject at all, if men of great eminence had not lent the sanction of their name to a contrary statement. The moral principles of Plato, wild and unintelligible as some of his speculative tenets are, can be misunderstood by none who have the slightest acquaintance with his writings. The former parts of the *Republic*, the *Laws*, the *Protagoras*, the *Phaedo*, the *Crito*, *Theaetetus*, all contain the same elevated views of moral obligation; his lessons are not reduced into method and exact system, but lie profusely scattered throughout his discussions, in every form of plain and practical precept,

⁹ See Barbeyrac's introduction to the Translation of Puffendorf.

¹⁰ Chap. 4.

¹¹ Chap. 7.

¹² Lib. v. chap. 10.

¹³ Lib. i, chap. 14.

ironical refutation, and beautiful imagery. It has been considered the glory of Socrates, to have brought philosophy down from heaven, by being the first to withdraw it from the physical theories of the ancient schools; and to apply it to the conduct of life, and the promotion of happiness and virtue: (this is not true of Socrates, for Pythagoras had done so at an earlier period); but when we read the admonitions of this extraordinary man, in the inimitable language of his disciple, we feel that in another sense he did indeed bring down philosophy from heaven; he taught it to move upon earth, preserving all the characters of a divine origin, clothed with celestial beauty, and speaking in the language of the gods.

Cudworth's treatise on *Immutable Morality*, composed for the express purpose of refuting the false systems prevalent in his time, contains little original matter. It is written in an elevated tone of thought and feeling, and may be referred to as a summary of Plato's moral theory, reduced to order and defended by argument: but it is to be lamented that what in other respects is an admirable treatise, should so frequently be deformed by the same ideal mysticism which distinguished his ancient prototype: and that some of his reasonings, like those of Plato, should have no better foundation to rest upon than ambiguities of words, puerile when intelligible altogether. This defect withdraws the attention of the reader from those parts of the work which are grounded in truth, and at the same time exposes the whole to the ridicule of those who would find some difficulty in combating the theory which the author supports, and the more solid arguments by which it is supported. It is remarkable also, not merely on account of its own intrinsic merits, but as having furnished to Kant the most important of his supposed discoveries in the phenomena of mind: Kant had evidently read, not only the *Theaetetus* and other dialogues of Plato with attention, but had profited largely by the labors of Cudworth: nor is it too much to assert that what is most valuable in the hypothesis of the German metaphysician may be traced to the discussions of the

English philosopher.¹⁴ Bishop Butler's *Discourses on Human Nature* are so well known and appreciated, that it is unnecessary to do more than allude to them: those who wish to see moral obligation placed upon its proper basis, would do well to study them with diligence: though the connection of the arguments is not so close and methodical as might have been expected from the talents and character of the writer, nor are they set off by any of the graces and ornaments of style which give currency and popularity to works of far inferior merit. Bishop Butler has shown most convincingly, that virtue is obedience to, and vice the violation of our own nature, taking not a partial view, but embracing the whole nature of man, and all the variety of internal feelings that belong to it; and if at any time he is erroneous, it is when he speaks somewhat inaccurately of conscience, as if the province of this heavenly monitor were to inspire and prescribe moral duties, instead of pronouncing its decisions when they have been infringed or observed. And to this system which we have delineated, and which is supported by the deepest thinkers of all ages, what other shall we oppose? It has been too much the practice of philosophers (and some of the English school are not exempt from the charge), to lower and degrade the basis of morality; to seek for it in earth rather than in heaven; to gather it out of the modes and relations of human custom and usage, accidentally determined, and which experience has shown to be expedient, rather than to build it upon the settled relations of things, and upon those faculties and feelings which conducted men to the right path, before experience could have pointed out the salutary consequences. As well might we suppose with the Epicurean, that children are led to take pleasure in the companionship of each other, by calculating the advantages of friendship, instead of being prompted by the

¹⁴ The remarks in Kant's preface to his *Critik der praktischen Vernunft* when speaking of Hume's principles, will remind the reader both of Plato and Cudworth. Kant allows in other parts of his works, that he was well acquainted with the *Theaetetus*: he boasts, indeed, that he understood the Grecian philosopher better than he comprehended himself.

kindly impulses of natural affection. If morality had been left to be established by the slow process of observing the benefits resulting from particular classes of actions, it would be difficult to understand how its chief duties came to be perceived so early; how it was that men whose views are so narrow and confined, should have been able so speedily to extract the truth with unerring certainty amid such a collision of temporal wants and personal interests; and have harmonized at once, with a profound and comprehensive insight into consequences, all those conflicting combinations into regular and established principles: it would be hard to account why the same principles were held sacred amidst nations so widely scattered, and living under so many forms of social polity, and such different stages of civilization. In other points there has been little identity of opinion as to the objects considered expedient, or the laws by which they are regulated; but on the chief moral questions there has been one concurring voice of approbation respecting the same particular modes of conduct. It should also be remarked, that those who consider expediency as the basis of morality, (using the term in its widest sense, as signifying that which is expedient to all ages and countries of mankind), still take too narrow a view of the consequences of actions. When we have embraced all the connecting links of the chain through the history of every period and nation, from the beginning to the end of time, the series may not yet be terminated: the chain may pass on to eternity and another state of being, the last link being in the hand of the Deity alone: and thus the moral principles, of which he has secured the certainty and immutability upon earth, by making them a law of our nature, and the salutary effects of which, upon the social union, we can duly appreciate, may be intended to produce other effects not yet developed; but which are known to him to whose omniscient mind belongs "the happiness of the whole created universe, because he is its Lord and Proprietor."¹⁵ Nor is it any argument against this view of

15 Bishop Butler.

moral obligation, that as society becomes more enlightened, and civilization advances, morality is better understood, and a more correct estimate of its just claims established. This amelioration is perhaps to a certain extent produced by observation of the pernicious effects of one class of actions, and the good consequences of another: but it may be questioned if any great changes on important points of duty have arisen from a sense of this expediency alone: it is because we have a high standard by which to compare the actions and customs of society, that we look forward with confidence to improvement: it is because we are enabled to examine the conduct of men in reference to the better principles of our nature, or to the positive precepts of revelation, which has sanctioned these principles, and is in accordance with them, that we expect many corrupt usages, at present existing will be at length abolished, and better modes adopted; till the law of honor, and other immoral conventions of the same kind, shall be made to yield to the claims of natural rectitude and revealed religion.

And though the doctrine of expediency (in the comprehensive sense of the word) has been held by men of virtuous and philosophical minds; nor does it at first sight seem open to great objections if properly understood; yet its tendency, when practically applied, is to produce lower and more degraded views till it loses itself in the system of those philosophers who make moral obligation, grounded upon no other basis than individual interest, or the decisions of the Supreme Power. And in fact it would seem necessarily to lead to this latter consequence: for if the effects of morality constitute its essence and obligation, what individual is entitled to pronounce upon them? What combination of individuals short of the highest authority in the state? Thus would might constitute right. Law would be left without any higher principles to decide upon its justice, and the sovereign will of the despot must be held as the sacred oracle of truth and morality: a convenient theory, which in no age has wanted defenders among tyrants and their flatterers: it was the doctrine by which the Greek philosopher

of old attempted to console Alexander for the murder of his friend; and Hobbes attempted to make his peace with Cromwell.

I cannot, however, close this article without again strongly recommending the study of moral philosophy, as by far the most necessary and valuable part of a liberal education. Considering the extent and variety of its subject-matter, it is hardly possible that some branches of it should not fall in with the taste, or accord with the future destination of every individual student among us, who has any capacity for philosophical investigation. We are living in an age when ignorance or superficial information is no longer tolerated among men who by birth or station form the higher ranks of society: those who are training up for the service of the Church will do well to recollect that the moral sciences not only strengthen the intellect, but are intimately connected with many questions which hereafter they may be called upon to discuss, either with professed infidels, or at all events with men who make false theories an excuse for vicious habits. But while such studies are valuable to the future theologian, they are equally valuable to the future legislator. The principles of legislation, and the elements of political knowledge, (a most important branch of moral philosophy) can safely be neglected by none who have a right to look forward to the discharge of civil duties. If the constitution has connected political power in all its various gradations with birth and property, it has done so upon this ground, because it was supposed that a class of men possessed of these advantages would be more likely to bring to the task the necessary qualifications for its proper exercise. In the early periods of our history, the barons had more knowledge than others of what was then considered valuable—they were the bravest and most skillful leaders in the field, and in civil questions they were at all events (with the exception of the clergy) the least ignorant in an ignorant age. And if the time should ever come, when the senators and landed proprietors of the country should suffer by neglect of their leisure and advantages, the inferior classes to surpass them in knowl-

edge, it must be obvious to all who reflect, that the principles upon which a mixed monarchy is formed (and such a government is most favorable to the happiness of a community) can no longer be maintained. Information is rapidly increasing among the middle and lower ranks and it is idle and unprofitable to exclaim against the diffusion of what is in itself a good; exclamations which, if not heard within universities, are frequent out of them: we cannot check the progress of knowledge, even were we inclined to do so; if there be danger to the form of government, arising out of a change in the elements of which it is composed, the only remedy for the evil will be found in the increased exertions of the aristocratical parts of it to retain their relative superiority, by that superiority in knowledge which their greater leisure and means of instruction will always enable them to acquire. It is worthy therefore of the consideration of many who are educated in our institutions, whether those who shall be content to assume their hereditary (as in Europe) seat, or to intrude themselves into the counsels of the nation, or to take upon them civil offices in a lower sphere, without endeavoring to prepare themselves beforehand, are not in reality the greatest enemies of those political institutions, which themselves for their own sake, and every good and wise man for the sake of all, would wish to uphold: their incompetence will not only be a disgrace to themselves—will not only directly injure the country, by giving birth to ill-digested enactments—but further than this, it will have a tendency to degrade the character of the government, both in its legislative and executive branches, and thus to undermine the foundation upon which our civil policy is erected. Nor let it be imagined that the line of study pointed out by universities cannot be made consistent with such preparation. Machiavel is often celebrated as one of the acutest political philosophers in modern ages: yet there are few principles in Machiavel which may not be traced to their source in the

discussions of Grecian writers. Whole chapters¹⁶ are literally copied, and the spirit of an entire treatise is borrowed without acknowledgement; he illustrated indeed his information by historical examples from later times, and he misapplied the truths which he had imbibed with the guilty sophistry of a corrupt heart; but the same knowledge which the subtle Florentine perverted to evil, may be directed by more moral minds to the promotion of public happiness and virtue. There is much in the laws of Plato, still more in the Politics of Aristotle (a book which no change of times or government can render obsolete), well calculated, when read with discrimination, to furnish the student of political science with many valuable hints both on the theory and the practice of governments.

In the present, when men seem divided into two classes, those who are infatuated with love of novelty and those who cling tenaciously to every ancient system, he may learn from the investigation of those writers to form a right judgment on the opinions of both: he may learn, that laws of long standing ought not to be hastily and rashly abolished, on account of the strong moral associations which they have created, by that very antiquity, in the understanding and affections of the people. It is this feeling operating throughout the members of a state, which gives to every kind of institution its stability, independent of its directly salutary effect, in promoting good and preventing evil, of which comparatively few can judge. But this just and reasonable respect for ancient systems ought not to make us unwilling to alter them, supposing they no longer produce the effects originally intended, or by a change of circumstances are likely to lead to injury, rather than advantageous consequences: because such consequences were the essential ends and objects for which all laws are supposed to be enacted.

16 The second chapter, for example, in the first book of his Discorsi upon the first Decad of Livy, is almost a literal translation from the sixth book of Polybius; and his celebrated treatise entitled *Il principe*, is little more than an expansion of the eleventh chapter in the fifth book of the *Politics* of Aristotle.

This is only one out of innumerable important lessons to be derived from the ancient writers: when such principles as those found in the fifth book of the *Politics* of Aristotle, are compared with the facts related in the historical works of Tacitus or Thucydides, of Clarendon or Lord Bacon; or illustrated by the argumentative eloquence that breathes or burns in the speeches of Demosthenes; what better course than this can be recommended as the basis of a sound political education? With this previous training, the student will pass on with more advantage to the cursory reading of such a work as Puffendorff *de Officio Hominis*, or to the more accurate study of his larger treatise on the *Law of Nature* and Nations, and to the general principles of English law in the writings of Blackstone: and if he proceeds afterwards to the minuter details of history or statistics, or to examine the chief questions in political economy, he will study all with a keener insight into the bearing of facts upon principles, with a more candid and sober mind, with a more enlarged and comprehensive judgment.

Alliance, Ohio.

ARTICLE VI.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

BY J. A. SINGMASTER

(From the January Quarterlies).

COLLEGE CHAPEL

The Rev. Paul Micou, Colege Sec'y. of the Episcopal Church, in an article in *Christian Education* places great stress in the spiritual value of the College Chapel. He concludes with a plea for greater reverence.

The one thing most needed in America today is a sense of reverence, an appreciation of the value of the spiritual. We have been told in these meetings that religion alone has the power to unify and interpret the college curriculum, and hence the Christian college is a great need in our educational system. Now college chapel fills this need *par excellence*. He sins greatly against what is finest in our students, who allows in chapel any light treatment of sacred moments and things. Our students come before us to be lifted into the presence of God once each day, and if it is our solemn duty and responsibility to do this for them. College Chapel can be the greatest means of bringing reverence and awe and divine Love into the hearts of the nation's future leaders. Let us study every possible way of securing this result.

THE BIBLE AND EDUCATION.

Prof. Samuel R. Braden in an article in *Christian Education* maintains that knowledge of the Bible is an essential part of a liberal education. The following paragraph holds that the Bible "prepares one for citizenship".

Does the Bible help one prepare for intelligent citizenship. Let us look at this question from four angles. (i)

Our national laws, customs, and institutions are so dependent upon the teachings of the Bible that even though one be an atheist he must know the Bible in order to understand the purposes underlying our system of government. (ii) Again, laws and institutions cannot abide in a vacuum; they require an atmosphere. In America this atmosphere is decidedly a religious one. Freedom, justice, mercy, brotherhood, reformation, co-operation, these are the purposes which underlie all of our civic life. And since the founders of the nation got these conceptions from the Bible, those who would perpetuate them must do the same. Not to do so will be to make the air in which our institutions live impure and injurious. (iii) One of the chief problems of citizenship is a knowledge of what is right and wrong, what is harmful and what is helpful. In a social order which daily becomes more complex, one dare not depend upon yesterday's conceptions of right and wrong. Each day brings forth new conditions of right and wrong. Each day brings forth new conditions which demands new decisions. Therefore, citizenship in this modern world demands of every individual a conscience which becomes constantly keener. Here is where the Bible proves its value; for it as no other study refreshes one's social responsibility and makes him feel that we are "all members of one body," and that the individual should not "think more highly of himself than he ought to think." These thoughts are essential in good citizenship.

(iv) At present we must get away from exclusive nationalism in our civic thinking. We must have some place in our philosophy for those of other nations and races. The essential brotherhood of man must be recognized. The Bible is the only place to go for this information where we can get at the same time the spirit in which we are to consider the foreigner. We may almost declare that we can never love other peoples apart from the Bible's influence.

THE GOSPEL AND SCIENCE.

Dr. Geo. W. Richards writing in the *Reformed Church Review* of the Modern View of the World declares that the Christian faith is in no sense of dependent on or conditioned by modern scientific views of the world. He asks,

Has the Christian anything to do with the modern scientific explanation of the world? We reply, no more no less than with the ancient mythological or philosophical view of the world. *His faith and the truth of the gospel are not dependent upon mythology, philosophy, or science, but upon revelation.* But the modern theologian ought to do with the gospel what the ancient theologians did—interpret its cosmic and historical significance in relation to the accepted views of the world of their time. This is an important task and the successful accomplishment of it will have relative value for the advancement of it will have relative value for the advancement of the Kingdom of God.

SEX EDUCATION.

In the same Review, Paul Dundore advises against placing in the hands of children books on sexual instruction. The entire article is full of sound sense.

Sex instruction, says Mr. Dundore, by means of books is not the best thing. They often tend to make the children morbid and stimulate the interest they seek to cure. They likewise too often prove a stimulant to crime. Most of the books on the subject of sex education ought to be boiled down. Most of these books are written by religionists and professionalists with a religious and moral basis by incompetent persons—persons who are too often prompted by the mercenary interest alone. I do not know of any books that I could recommend for children on sex education. Perhaps W. S. Scott's books, *Life Beginnings* for the boy of twelve, and *From Youth to Manhood* for a boy of fifteen, are the best on the market. The same writer has a book on *Life Problems* the first 32

pages fitted for girls from twelve to fourteen and the remainder of the book for older girls. But I doubt whether any book should be placed into the hands of the child. I would advise against it.

My own opinion, he continues, is that loyalty or honor is the strongest motive that makes for purity at the age of pubescence. The age of thirteen is the time when the "gang spirit" is at its height and a characteristic trait of the "gang" is loyalty. It is a fundamental social virtue. The members of the "gang" give evidence of their loyalty not merely to the individual, the group, but to ideals as well. At this age the loyalty appeal will keep the boy true to his mother, his father, to society and to God. Upon honor he will not violate the confidence of his parents, and the trust imposed upon him by his Maker. Upon honor he will reverence his body as the temple of the Holy Ghost. Upon honor he will deport himself to the opposite sex as he would wish other boys to regard his own sister. Due to this characteristic spirit of loyalty and honor in the boy at the age of pubescence the parent and religious teacher can win the confidence and friendship of the boy and help to create and preserve in his soul an ideal of manly chivalry that will effectively withstand both the insidious temptation of secret sin and the bolder inducements of social vice. Parent, preacher and teacher can best perform their saving ministry among the adolescent in the field of sex education through the mighty medium of personal friendship which is the flower and fruitage of loyalty.

COMMUNITY CHURCHES.

The Christian Union Quarterly in an article on Coöperation, the Road to Unity, by Rev. Dr. A. W. Fortune advocates community churches under certain circumstances.

Three types of community church are being tried with greater or less degree of success: "the union church with no denominational connection; the federated church

which is made up of two or more churches, each of which maintains connection with its own denomination; and the denominational church which functions for the community by including all Christians in its programme." Each of these types has its defects. The union church lacks the inspiration of a great task because it is not affiliated with missionary agencies. The federated church lacks unity and presents difficulties in selecting pastors and receiving new members. The denominational church is more or less exclusive because of denominational connection.

There is an insistent demand today that some method be adopted in small communities which will enable the church to minister to the spiritual needs of all. When a church stands alone in the community it is obligated to serve every Christian interest in the place. The statement is made in the report of the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook that "a church which will not include in its fellowship all worthy Christians is challenged when it claims the right to occupy exclusively a single field. It should include all, else it should give way to a church which will." This report makes a distinction between fellowship and membership. It says it may be impossible at present to include all in the membership, but all should be made to feel at home in the fellowship.

PROGRESSIVE CALVINISM.

Dr. Herbert D. Foster of Dartmouth has the following to say of the progressive character of Calvin's teachings, in an article in the *Harvard Theological Review*.

There was something else not quite as concretely and easily definable in Calvin and his followers; a fearless spirit of reexamination of premises, a logic so thorough-going that it seems characteristic rather of the French than the ordinary English-speaking people of a certain type, the Puritans. This spirit may be described as that of taking the next step. Calvin not only said, "We must walk each according to his station," but also, "We must

walk forward and grow, so that our hearts may be capable of things we cannot now understand. If our last day finds us going forward, we shall learn beyond this world what we could not learn here." This not merely forward-looking but forward moving spirit made Calvinism a growing, questioning force, bound to pass beyond any temporary creed, form of worship, or government, whether church or state, because it always pursued Truth, "God's oldest daughter," as the Huguenot Condé described it. "The desire for investigating truth," Calvin taught, "has been implanted in the human mind." The truth should be told even if it hurt some one who cannot comprehend it; for it is better "that he that can comprehend may do so, rather than not to tell the truth and thereby not only prevent both persons from comprehending but also make the more intelligent of the two become worse, whereas, if he had learned and comprehended, others might learn through him."

THE RELATION OF RELIGION AND SCIENCES.

Prof. Geo. M. Stratton of the University of California writes in *The Journal of Religion* on "Where has Psychology left Religion?" He has the following excellent paragraph on the relation of science and religion.

Religion is likewise not to be confused with science, nor to be wholly influenced by it. Religion has its own ground, its own dignity and privilege. In science the great work of making clear the character of reality is incomplete. For every question answered, ten new questions are brought to light. Knowledge grows more to more, but ignorance grows faster. The outline and frame and foundation of the world, mental and physical, will long be in scientific doubt. But life cannot wait; there must all the while be a guiding intuition of what exceeds strict knowledge, an assumption of what experience will reveal, giving substance to things unseen. And it is part of the office of religion to direct and discipline these anticipations, suggesting the form of truth entire where

science offers but a fragment. The intuitions of religion must not take the place nor be rivals of the findings of scientific knowledge; they must accept and include all this knowledge and organize it, working forward where science ends, supplementing, sketching ahead, while science slowly and surely toils on, its work incomplete. But beyond the findings of science are the personal guesses, the intuitions of the scientists. But these are without authority, and religion is free to offer in rivalry its own less personal, more racial and universal, affirmations. But when stating what is fact, when affirming its own evidence of things unseen, we must know that in all this it is an agent *ad interim*, a surrogate, acting until science enters in power and for itself. Religion is in this, and rightly, ever being crowded back by science; it must yield at once when science makes its well-attested declaration.

HOME MISSIONS.

The Augustana Quarterly (March) in an article on "Statistics" by V. J. Vestling expresses the opinion that his Church must depend on Home Missions for growth. He declares himself in hearty accord with the merging of weaker congregations.

We must interest our people in Home Missionary Work. How? By trying to raise a lot of money for work of that kind? Not yet? we are not ready. How get ready? By placing facts and figures before our people in such shape and manner that they will readily see where we are at. Of course there will be more mergers of Lutheran bodies sooner or later—God speed the day—but Home Missionary work should be prosecuted vigorously nevertheless. If we have a handful of people in, say, a Norwegian Lutheran community, and the work is well established, then let our people join the Lutheran congregation already on the field, unless there is ample room for two Lutheran congregations and the prospect is good for our work. Then the money and labor otherwise to be used on the field can be used on some other field

where there is no Lutheran work and where there should be work of this kind. Besides in this way mergers will be hastened. As a Lutheran Church we have considerable over-lapping work, money is wasted. Mergers would release men for work on fields where the work is actually needed. Why not try to get along with other Lutherans in this life? We all have faults, but we might help each other to get rid of many faults. Aloofness will not build up a strong Lutheran Church. Let us not keep on talking about our independence and refuse to work with other Lutherans. If we do we will soon find ourselves at the dead-line.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND CHRIST.

In the *Princeton Review*, Prof. O. T. Allis in an article on "The Conflict Over the O. T." makes the strong point that the O. T. was Christ's Bible with his fullest endorsement. He concludes as follows:

But the ultimate fact is this. The Old Testament as we have it is not merely a part of our Mother's Bible. It has not merely nourished the faith of our Puritan ancestors and of the Reformers and of the Christians of the Early Church. It is *the* Bible of Christ and His apostles. This is conceded by the critics. Even so radical a scholar as Cornill admits that in the time of Christ "almost the same books were counted as Holy Scripture as are found in our Old Testament." And one critic, Professor Rogers, tells us that Jesus "fed and feasted his own soul upon the Old Testament, whose books were to him the Scriptures." Yet He did not stumble at its imperfections. He quoted from it frequently. He said of it as a whole: "The scripture cannot be broken." He said of the Law: "Not a jot or tittle shall pass from the Law till all be fulfilled." And of Moses He said expressly, "If ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" What more serious arraignment can there be of ethics and aesthetics, of the moral elevation and spiritual discernment of men who call themselves Christians, than the fact that they cannot accept His Bible as He did, as the very Word of God?

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR J. L. NEVE.

Evolution.

The fine work under the title "Glauben und Wissen" by Dr. Edmund Hoppe, professor of natural science in the university of Goettingen of 1914, has just appeared in a second supplemented edition (C. Bertelsmann in Guetersloh, 1922. Price \$1 bound. Pages 387). It is a book worthy to be translated into English. In discussions of a semi-popular nature the author undertakes to prove with great scholarship that evolution cannot stand in the crucible of real scientific investigation. The book deals with the following subjects: (1) Evolution and Revelation; (2) The Thought of Development, its Truth and its Limits; (3) The Energetic World View. (4) The First Human Beings; (5) Mind or Instinct; (6) The Report on Creation; (7) Abiding Values of Civilization. (8) Life; (9) Of Dying; (10) Are there Miracles? (11) The Ancient World View and Apologetics; (12) The Modern World View; (13) Religion and Christianity; (14) Believing and Knowing (Glauben und Wissen).

The author suggests that the yielding to materialism on the foundations of evolution and monism was Germany's real sin when drifting toward the World War. Were the other nations innocent in this respect? And he says there is only one way for Germany to rise again—by repentance and regeneration.

In the first chapter Dr. Hoppe says at one place in substance: Evolution and revelation are in conflict with each other, and the warfare which evolution as a theory is waging against revelation is the present-day form of the old struggle between faith and unbelief. True, there have been philosophers such as Paulsen, who thought that mediation was possible, and there have been theologians who have tried to combine the views of God and

world. But in examining what in such efforts is left of revelation we find that it is simply something which man reveals or discovers. By revelation we understand the working of the divine Being either in immediate acts in the material world or through a spiritual influence upon individual men. And what do we understand by evolution? The word is capable of a two-fold meaning, and for this reason the controversy on the evolution theory makes us witnesses of a grand spectacle of jugglery. Of course, everything that is and has life and as long as it has life is in a process of unfolding. This has reference to the development of the cosmos, of the earth, and of organisms upon the earth, of the species and of the individuals. We see true progress of our age in the larger emphasis upon this development. It is not true that we are opposed to this conception of development (described in detail in Chapter II).

The evolution theory which stands as an antithesis to divine creation and revelation may be described as follows: All that is has developed itself out of itself, not as a development of imparted or endowed forces, but, possessing within itself both matter and force, it has, without injection of any outside energy, made itself what it now is. The author rejects this position outright. He even refuses to listen to the suggestion that at some time God endowed matter with force for development; neither will he admit that God stepped in at the point where the development from the inorganic to the organic took place and again at the point where the human mind appears. "Then there would have been three times when God had something to do with this world," he says "But where was He for the rest of the time and where is He now? I confess that I cannot imagine a divine Being who during all eternity gave evidence of His existence only three times and was inactive for the rest of the time. Inactivity can be predicated only of that which has no existence." But need we say that God was ever inactive because we hold that there was a special creative activity at certain times? Does not the Biblical account speak of a

special time when God created heaven and earth and when He made man in His own image? The author is a layman in this field. He is not a theologian but a real thoroughly equipped scientist. Of course, these few quotations cannot do justice to the book.

"Away from Wellhausen".

This is the title of a publication by Lic. Theol. Martin Kegel (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh, 1923, 70 pages, 25 cents). It is one of the many reactions against the notorious work entitled "Die Grosse Täuschung" (The Great Deception) by Friedrich Delitzsch, Professor in Berlin, who died recently and who was the radical son of the famous Prof. Franz Delitzsch of Leipzig. But the author of the publication here under consideration turns against Wellhausen, because he says that the younger Delitzsch's radical work, in which he represented the arrangement of the Old Testament books as a deliberate fraud, is only the natural sequence to the "Prolegomena to the History of Israel" written by Wellhausen. He suggests an interesting and fitting parallel when he says: "So it was in the field of the New Testament when, after many attacks upon traditional history of Jesus, David Friedrich Strauss, in the year of 1835, published his 'Life of Jesus'." The author also shows how Vatke, and Wellhausen built on Hegel's evolutionary conception of history and he adds the following apt statement: "Hegel begat Vatke; Vatke begat Wellhausen; Wellhausen begat Delitzsch; but Delitzsch became the grave-digger of Hegel's method of treating the history of Israel."

A New Theology.

In Germany there is a new theology in the making. Dr. Schreiner writes in a weekly appearing in Bielefeld-Bethel:

If there is anything that becomes clearer from day to day it is the complete collapse of the pre-war liberalism.

The catastrophes of the last few years have revealed inexorably the real truth regarding men, the world and civilization. The latest German theology, which has been deeply impressed by the great events of the recent past, is developing along lines entirely foreign to the old liberalistic views. It is a development which amounts to a powerful protest against the shallowness of the intellectualism that characterized the bygone age with its negative dissection of the Biblical records and its optimism regarding men and their work. The Kultur-Protestantism of E. Troeltsch was a deception, and the younger generation of our theologians have come to feel it with a fine instinct. A hunger and thirst for God has come upon the land. It can be observed even among the representatives of philosophy. I refer to a work such as Fr. Brunstaed of Erlangen "Die Idee der Religion" and the powerful blows which he is directing against the kind of Protestantism that followed Albrecht Ritschl and claimed a home-right in theology and in the Church. Dr. Schreiner has this statement: "The books which the younger generation of theologians are reading are those *between Heiler and Heim.*" What does this mean?

"Between Heiler and Heim."

Lic. Erich Stange, editor of the "Pastoralblaetter," talks upon this subject in the issue of October 1922 (pp. 14 ff.). We shall quote him in a summarizing way:

Each generation of theologians, he suggests, is stimulated usually by a few literary works, say about four or five. As such we could name for the past generation the investigations of Harnack on the dogma, the "Prolegomena" of Wellhausen and the investigations of Bernhard Weiss and Theodore Zahn. We mention these to indicate the problems and issues that have characterized the age of our fathers. And so we could mention four or five books which the young theologians of to-day are reading and to which they are aiming to find an attitude of their own. These are all characteristic of a new epoch of

theological work, which is in the making. We mention them as follows: (1) Heiler's works on the History of Religion, especially his great work on prayer. (2) Barth's remarkable interpretation of Paul's letter to the Romans. (3) Gиргенсоhn's work of 712 pages "Der Seelische Aufbau des Religioesen Erlebens" (Religious Experience as Developing in Man's Soul). Gиргенсоhn has become the successor of Bishop Ihmels as professor in Leipzig. (4) Otto, "Das Heilige" (The Things Sacred), a book that has had nine editions, the eighth edition was sold out in four weeks. (5) Heim, "Glaubensgewissheit" (Assurance by Faith). Differing as to aims and theological position, these books have three things in common, which are characteristic of this new theology: (1) They turn to new issues and problems. They do not line up with any Richtungen of the past. The past of more than one generation was characterized by the endeavours of finding an attitude to the supranatural. (2) The methods of these new theologians are new. They pay little attention to historico-critical questions. If they have anything like that, it stands in the service of a special ideology. The argumentation employs the thoughts of the psychology of religion. It is bound to influence the future treatment of systematic theology. (3) The most characteristic trait in this new theology is the new way of arriving at an understanding of the irrational. In the presentation by Harnack, Christianity appeared as something rational, as something capable of definition everywhere. But it is different, for instance, with the conception of God by Barth, or with the analysis of religious certainty by Heim. Indeed, we observe that the change is not in method only; there has been a rediscovery of a type of piety that had been lost sight of in an age that was orientated preeminently by intellectualism. This turn has made possible a new positive and approving attitude to the miracle, to revelation, to the wrath of God (Otto) and to the cross of Christ (Gогarten). True, there is still a difference between this theology and the old orthodoxy, but this new theology is

diametrically opposed to the rationalistic negation of the supranatural by a past liberalism.

German Theology.

Some time ago, in a lecture, a prominent theologian of the Anglican Church, predicted that German theology, of which he said that it had never been creative, would soon be in its grave. The hope was based upon the economic breakdown of Germany and the effect which this will have upon the German universities. We leave out of consideration the charge that German theology has not been creative. Read the "History of German Theology in the Nineteenth Century" by F. Lichtenberger (translated from the French into English by W. Hastie), Edinburgh, 1889; or "The Place of Christ in Modern Theology" by A. M. Fairbairn, New York Scribner's, 1916; or "History of Christian Thought since Kant" by E. C. Moore (Harvard), N. Y., Scribner's, 1912; or "Recent Phases of German Theology" by J. L. Nuelson (Jennings and Graham), 1908; or Kahnis "The Inner Trend of German Protestantism;" and R. Seeberg's book "At the threshhold of the Twentieth Century"—and you will receive an impression of how ridiculous such a statement is. Our interest here is in the question: Will German theology have to yield the leading position which it has held in the past? In answering this question we quote, first, a remark by John A. Faulkner, Professor of Church History in Drew Theological Seminary in his very scholarly book "Modernism and the Christian Faith," 1921 (Methodist Book Concern, New York). He says page 217: "I dare say one single university in a little German town produced more theologians in a hundred years than all the schools in England in three hundred." Our judgment is: In the field of natural science, medicine, and so on, where many instruments and much equipment are needed, Germany is bound to be crippled if there is no change in the economic situation. But theology, with idealism, has always

flourished in times of great tribulation. Theology grows under the cross (*theologie crucis*). This is an experience very familiar to the fathers of our Church. The great theology that followed the age of Rationalism in Germany grew out of the miseries accompanying the Napoleonic invasions about the beginning of the last century. When the political horizon is hopelessly dark then interest turns from things material to idealism and to the things satisfying man's spiritual nature. It was in the days when the old Roman empire was falling that Bishop Augustine sat in a little town of North Africa and wrote his immortal work: *De Civitate Dei* (The City of God).

Just a few months ago, there appeared in Germany the second volume of a work which as a philosophy of history can be compared only with this work of Augustine and with the philosophy of Hegel (upon a basis of thought, however, which makes Hegel's evolution superfluous). Our reference is to Spengler's *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*. The reviews on the first volume of this work have been so many that a selection of the best of these have been published in a special book (Schroeter, "The Conflict about Spengler, A critique of his Critics." Munich, 1922). In his second volume Spengler describes the life and character of eight civilizations which came and went or are going, delineating them in the light of all their natural endowments as well as constructive and the disintegrating forces that characterized their rising and falling. The reviews of this volume that had been awaited impatiently are now filling the periodicals arriving from Germany.

We have mentioned this work of Spengler merely to show that in times of great tribulation philosophy and theology do not perish but flourish. Talleyrand, at the time of the great Napoleon, described the difference between the English, the French and the Germans in this way: When the earth was divided God gave to the English the sea, the French the land, and the Germans the air in which to build castles. Another one has expressed the difference in the type of mind between these

nationalities as follows: In trouble the Englishman takes to travel, the Frenchman to the theatre, the German to seclusion and writes poetry. The Germans are at heart idealistic. And the philosophy of idealism favors theology.

In spite of indescribable privations on the part of students the German universities are filled. In Saxony the situation of the ministers is especially hard. Most of them must do other work to make their living. One minister who works in a bank half of the day during the whole week writes in a personal letter: "My son studies in Rostock under very trying material deprivations; my daughter studies in Leipzig and she just sent us word that she had passed successfully her Hebrew examination."

ARTICLE VII.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

APOLOGETICS.

God or Gorilla: How the Monkey Theory of Evolution Exposes Its Own Methods, Refutes Its Own Principles, Denies Its Own Inferences, Disproves Its Own Case. By Alfred Watterson McCann, Author and Journalist. The Devin-Adair Company, New York, 1922. Cloth, pp. 340. Twenty-seven full-page illustrations. Price \$3 net.

The startling and somewhat offensive title of this popular book was probably adopted in order to call attention to a subject which would have lost its appeal had it been given the commonplace title of "Evolution." The name Watterson and the incisive style of the author suggest the late, eloquent and picturesque "Marse Henry" of the Louisville *Courier-Journal*. Mr. McCann is a distinguished writer on the *New York Globe*, has made a life study of biology, and is apparently thoroughly versed in the facts and the literature of his subject. He is possessed of a spirit of indignation at the attempts of alleged learned men to foist upon the credulous a mere theory of human origin, unrestrained by facts, contradictory and inconsistent in its supposed proofs, derogatory to the Creator and humiliating to man.

The immediate source of Mr. McCann's indignation is the fact that in a great public institution, the American Museum of Natural History in New York City, Prof. Henry Fairfield Osborn has arranged in four glass cases "evidence" of man's ape origin. In case No. 2, for instance, he has mounted a bust of the Piltdown man conceived and executed by Prof. J. H. McGregor, as associate of Dr. Osborn. The bust is described as a "restoration," a "missing link," a "sort of side branch of the human family which has left no descendants at all." Now, these curators are undeniably men of great learning, of international reputation, and of unimpeachable character; but their work does not appeal to Mr. McCann and many thousands of other intelligent men, who believe that curators may, after all, be mistaken in their efforts to interpret fossils. The pros and cons of evolution are end-

less. Our author, however, does not stand without strong scientific support. For instance, he quotes Prof. Vernon Kellogg, of Leland Stanford University, as saying "that no indubitable cases of species forming or transforming, that is, of descent, have been observed; and that no recognized cases of natural selection really selecting have been observed." It is his opinion that we are ignorant of the processes of so-called evolution.

In a widely quoted address made before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at Toronto, William Bateson, of London, maintains that evolution is a mysterious fact and that the origin of species has not been discovered.

That man has descended through a long line of ancestors the latest of whom is some form of ape is certainly without any proof. The late Dr. Haeckel, of Germany, the greatest of recent materialistic evolutionists, was convicted of falsifying illustrations in the interest of his theory, thus discrediting himself and his teachings. The efforts to reconstruct the skeletons of men from the few remains discovered at Neanderthal (in 1856) and elsewhere have not been successful. Intelligent laymen will always remain incredulous as long as no better evidence of a simian ancestry is offered.

As a practical matter, evolution does not enter into the faith of the Christian. It may be true in a measure or untrue; but it can in no sense conflict with the truth that God made man in His own image, and that we are His children. Nevertheless, it is not only proper but imperative that wrong teachings in any department of thought should be exposed and resisted by those who are competent to do so.

J. A. S.

The Truth of Christianity, Being an Examination of the More Important Arguments for and against Believing in that Religion. Compiled from various sources by Lt. Col. W. H. Turton, D.S.O., late Royal Engineers. Ninth edition. Fortieth thousand. Wells Gardner, Darton & Co., Ltd. London, 1919. Pp. 512. Price, 2 shillings.

Since the first publication of this volume some twenty years ago it has reached a wide circulation and the general commendation of evangelical reviewers. It sets forth the usual arguments for the existence of God, the

freedom of man, and the possibility and probability of a supernatural revelation. It offers evidence of the credibility of the facts and doctrines of the Old Testament and the New Testament as seen in history. He defends inspiration and miracles and the Deity of our Lord, whose teachings, life, character and influence are the abundant guaranty of the truth of Christianity.

J. A. S.

Our Protestant Heritage. By W. Wofford T. Duncan. The Methodist Book Concern, New York. 12mo. 130 pages. Price \$1.00 net.

Three sermons preached by the author while pastor of Emory Methodist Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The titles are The Intellectual Heritage of Protestantism, The Moral Heritage of Protestantism, and The Spiritual Heritage of Protestantism. They were called forth by the publication in a number of Pittsburgh dailies of a long series of paid advertisements financed by the Roman Catholic Church as a propaganda of its faith. They are plain and convincing presentations of the Protestant faith and point of view as over against the claims of the Catholics, but show a calm and judicious spirit. They make interesting reading, and offer a large amount of material of an apologetic nature to any who may chance to find it necessary to defend their faith against attack from the unrelenting foes of Protestantism.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

Matter and Spirit. By Prof. James Bissett Pratt, Professor of Philosophy in Williams College. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922. Cloth, pp. ix, 230. Price, \$1.50.

With a naive frankness the author says in the preface: "If there be anything individual about this book, it is, I suppose, its outspoken defense of Dualism. The time has come, as it seems to me, for those of us (and we are many) who refuse to be browbeaten by the fantastic exaggerations of a dogmatic Naturalism and who are no longer to be fooled by the spiritual phraseology of a monistic Idealism which is really no less destructive to most of man's spiritual values and most of his dearest

hopes then is Naturalism itself—it is time, I say, for those of us who cannot accept either of these unempirical philosophies to come forward frankly with the opposing view and call ourselves dualists before our critics have the opportunity to brand us with that opprobrious title."

The author carefully examines the several theories of the relations of mind and body. He shows the utter untenability of Materialism, which makes mind the offspring of matter; and of Parallelism, which makes mind and matter move in lines which never converge. He holds that the theory of Interaction, as taught by Plato and Christianity, offers the only rational explanation of life. Mind and matter represent realities, which cannot be explained away. They are not identical in nature or duration. The former dominates the latter and will survive it.

J. A. S.

Apology and Polemic in the New Testament. By Rev. Andrew D. Heffern, D.D., late Professor in New Testament Literature and Language, Philadelphia Divinity School. New York. The Macmillan Co. 1922. Cloth. Pp. 411. Price, \$3.50.

This book is constituted of the Bohlen Lectures for 1915, delivered in Holy Trinity Episcopal Church, Philadelphia. They were not ready for publication until 1920, shortly before the death of the distinguished author. They are the ripe result of special study on this particular theme for forty years, resulting in a volume of the highest merit. Its purpose as expressed in the preface is to present a connected and comprehensive view of the New Testament from the standpoint of Apology through which the truth was established against attacks from without and within. The author practically justifies the face value of the New Testament as received by the Church. He has thoroughly investigated the critical theories bearing on the subject, sifting out the errors which reflect upon the integrity of the Scriptures. He shows that Christianity instead of being a syncretic religion, composed of Aryan, Semitic, Greek and Roman elements, "was a new creative force, a new covenant, and new and complete revelation, a new life." Only divine guidance, knowledge of facts and a rich personal experience of the truth in Christ could have enabled the apostolic authors to give us the New Testament uncontaminated by the specious errors of their age. Dr. Heffern has left an enduring monument.

J. A. S.

A System of Christian Evidence. By L. S. Keyser, D.D., Professor in Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio. Author of various treatises. Second Edition. Lutheran Literary Board, Burlington, Ia., 1922 . Cloth, pp. 253. Price, net, \$1.75.

It is gratifying that Dr. Keyser's "System of Christian Evidence" has reached its second edition, which indeed amounts to a new work. The former edition has been recast and greatly amplified. This volume is a fine vindication of the authenticity and the divine inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures, which are the foundation of the Christian faith. The author presents arguments new and old in defense of the Bible against the assaults of ignorance and unbelief. He has traversed the wide field of apologetic literature for material on his theme and has marshaled it with consummate skill. The cumulative force of his arguments is irresistible to the candid reader. While the volume is primarily intended as a textbook, it will be read with profit by all interested. A young student will receive vast benefit from a work so fundamental.

J. A. S.

THE MINISTRY.

The Ministry as a Life Work. By Rupert L. Webb, D.D. The Macmillan Company, New York. 12mo. 96 pages Price \$1.00.

Dr. Webb is the Corresponding Secretary of the Northern Baptist Education Society. His work has brought him to face the problem of finding more candidates for the ministry, which is one of the burning questions in practically all the churches. He has evidently studied the problem to some purpose, and he seeks in this volume to place the results of his study at the service of the boys and young men who may be, or ought to be, thinking seriously of their own personal relation to this need. He discusses the Call to the Ministry, the Training for it, its Opportunities, its Discouragements, its Attractions, its Rewards, etc., in a way that must make a strong appeal to really earnest and thoughtful young men of the best type.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

DEVOTIONAL.

The Message of Stewardship, a Book for Daily Devotions and Class Study. By Ralph S. Cushman. The Abingdon Press, New York. Cloth, pp. 240. Price, \$1 net.

This book has been written with the purpose of indicating the inestimable value of the stewardship message, by showing that the principle of stewardship underlies the entire message of the Old and New Testament. We believe that the author has succeeded in his purpose. There are ten chapters on Stewardship in its various relations. Each chapter is divided into A Daily Reading with comments, A Meditation, and A Prayer. Each division is enriched with great thoughts and helpful quotations and illustrations. The entire literature on the subject has been laid under tribute. We hope that every pastor will get this book at once.

J. A. S.

Common Service Book with Hymnal, Mission Edition, No. 590. United Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia, Pa. Price \$1.25 per copy prepaid, or \$12 per dozen, Transporation extra.

We are much pleased with this new edition of our standard Service and Hymn Book, with notes. Printed from the same plates as the more expensive edition, it resembles the latter so closely that only a comparison will distinguish them. By reducing the margins and using a different paper, this excellent book has been produced at a most moderate price, which amounts to only two cents a Sunday for a year! No book of equal work except the Bible can be had for so small a price. We congratulate the Publication House on this achievement.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

The Social Unrest, Capital, Labor and the Public in Turmoil. In two volumes. Edited by Lyman P. Powell, D.D., LL.D. The Review of Reviews Co., N. Y., 1919. Cloth. Pp. 786 in the two volumes.

These volumes are a collection of articles and quotations from the writings of distinguished publicists and specialists on the various departments of government,

finance, education, labor and capital, railroads, business in general, sanitation and the like. They include authors like Roosevelt, Taft, Woodrow Wilson, C. W. Eliot, A. Mitchell Palmer, Abraham Flexner, Henry S. Prichett, and Herbert Hoover. The average reader will learn much from these books concerning the condition of the world and the remedies which are supposed to be necessary to make it better. Several chapters are all keyed to a high ethical standard and represent the best ideas from a purely secular viewpoint. Only rarely and that almost incidentally does religion appear as a factor in the problems discussed. In a brief sentence, however, Herbert Hoover is quoted as saying: "I do not know any way to create a moral passion in a free people except through the Church." The greatest statesman that ever lived revealed the secret of a new world when He said, "Without me, ye can do nothing."

J. A. S.

The Reconstruction of Religion. A Socialistic View. By Charles A. Ellwood, Professor of Sociology in the University of Missouri. The Macmillan Co., N. Y. Cloth, pp. 323. Price, \$2.25.

This volume, of which the publishers say that in no other work will be found so well summarized, the principles of what we may call The New Reformation, rests on the assumption that Jesus was an historic person, but that so-called Christianity has misinterpreted Him. It alleges that the religious revolution which we are now undergoing, if it does not fail and lead to a reversion, concerns the transition from theological to ethical monism, from a metaphysical to a social and scientific conception of religion. We remark that "the religious revolution" is confined very largely to Socialists, Unitarians and naturalistic evolutionists. The socalled transition from theological to ethical monism is pure nonsense, because there is no antithesis between the two. Moreover, metaphysics cannot be avoided in any rational discussion of the supernatural. The constant assertion on the part of the modern sociological group that religion must be socialized is without point, because Christianity from the beginning contemplated the leavening of all society. The outstanding doctrine of love to one's neighbor, and the last commission of Jesus, emphasize the idea of a great human brotherhood.

Positive Christianity, it is claimed by Dr. Ellwood,

must be strictly in harmony with Science, by which he evidently means, although he does not say it in so many words, that the Deity of Jesus is a myth and that miracles do not occur. "The religious revolution" which is supposed to be going on, need alarm no devout believer. Everything that is good in Dr. Ellwood's book is not new, and everything new in it is not good.

J. A. S.

SOCIAL REFORM.

Familiar Talks on that Boy and Girl of Yours. By Wilbur F. Crafts, Ph.D. The Baker & Taylor Company, New York. 12mo. 432 pages.

Dr. Crafts is one of the best known and most highly respected leaders in Social Reform in this country. Practically his entire life has been devoted to this line of work, and he has been ably assisted by his excellent wife, who is almost as widely known as he. For many years he has been the Superintendent of the International Reform Bureau in Washington. In this volume he has brought together and presented in a most interesting and attractive way a great mass of information, including the latest statistics on the subject. There is also a multitude of quotations from the best writers and speakers. The book is a library in itself and will be indispensable to anyone who is interested in the study of sociology or social reform especially as related to the family. Dr. Craft's thesis is that "by right influences brought to bear on childhood by home and school and Church and Government we may develop in a new generation of citizens a regnant purpose to be of service to God and man."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

SOCIOLOGY.

Problems of the New World. By J. A. Hobson. The Macmillan Company, New York. 12mo. 277 pages. Price \$2.50.

This is not a new book. It was published in 1921. It is some time since we read it. In glancing through it now for review we find many marks and pencilled notes on the margins indicating considerable dissent from the positions taken and the conclusions drawn by the author.

But we found it a stimulating and thought-provoking book, and therefore we are glad to call attention to it even at this late day. The discussion is divided into five parts under the general topics, The Collapse of the Old Order, The Civilian Mind, the Tragic-Comedy of War-Idealism, The New Industrial Revolution, and A New World. Under each of these main divisions there are from two to six chapters discussing the subjects in more detail. The author regards the World War as only the first act in a great drama which is to extend over many years and perhaps many generations, and in which the whole world becomes the stage and all its peoples actors. He charges the guardians of every established institution, the State, the Church, Class, Party, even the Family, with constant "fumbling" in their frantic efforts to find a scheme of structural repair. He claims that the reason for this fumbling is that they "have failed to take account of certain important revelations which the tumultuous events of these years have made regarding that Human Nature which is the operative principle in History." He then goes on to say, "My object in these chapters is to focus these war lights so as to provide some clearer understanding of the practical problems that demand solution if a New World of order and progress is to emerge."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

Facing Reality. By Esme Wingfield-Stratford, D.Sc., Ex-Fellow King's, Cambridge. George H. Doran Company, New York. 8vo. 240 pages. Price \$2.50 net.

This is not a very cheerful book to read. This, however, would not be a good reason for not reading it. No wise man would refuse to take needed medicine just because it was disagreeable to the taste. The author of this volume thinks that society is in a bad way and needs heroic treatment, and he proceeds to administer it. He thinks that very few men see straight or think straight, or really care to do so; that we are blinded by our prejudices, or allow others to fool us by all kinds of mental illusions and delusions, so that we live in "a world of chimeras, invented by advertising, by journalism, by political and social catch-phrases, by men's disinclination to think straight." His book is a ringing call to wake up out of sleep, to stop dreaming that all is well, to put away our too optimistic illusions, to see things as they are, in other words to face reality.

With much that he says we can agree, with a good deal

of it we must disagree. Probably he would say that our disagreement is due to the fact that we are not ready to face reality. But it might be best to let the author speak for himself. In the Introduction to his volume he gives an unusually good account of his aims and of his plan of development, as will be seen from the following paragraphs:

"In the following pages I have tried to show the danger in which our civilization stands owing to its neglect of reality. Our advance in mechanical power during the last century and a half has transformed the conditions of human life. Its ever increasing pace and complexity call for a corresponding advance in mental and social organization.

"No such advance has been made or even seriously attempted. We have gone on feverishly improving the machines and leaving the rest to chance; in consequence, our increased powers have been turned to wasteful and mutually destructive purposes. We have the power to smash civilization to pieces and in both the international and domestic spheres are preparing to use it, for want of a sane attempt to order our affairs to the best advantage.

"I have first tried to show the nature and unique urgency of the crisis through which civilization is passing. I have next traced its development out of the failure of mankind to adapt itself mentally to its advance in physical power. In default of any rational effort to control the situation, free play was given to an anarchy of egotisms, private and national, which not only dissipated the hard-won spoils of nature but actually turned them to a fearful menace.

"An attempt is next made to examine in more detail the mental habits bequeathed from a state of civilization which our own efforts have outdated. The hope of appreciating or facing reality is frustrated by reason being made a slave to will. Our judgment, our will, are distorted by passion; positively by our desire to see things as we would have them, negatively by our distaste for taking more mental trouble than we can help. The results of this turning away from the truth are traced in creative art, in politics, in the social system, and finally in religion."

The next two or three paragraphs are a little more hopeful and optimistic. We can give only the substance of them:

"There is no need that civilization should perish.... The disease and the remedy are within ourselves.... The

problem is, in its essence, one of religion. But religion itself is, more than any other human activity, infected by our haphazard and slovenly methods of thought, so that the very name has come to be associated with myth and make-believe. But if we are to get right with reality or, in the time-honoured evangelical phrase, with God, it must be by a ruthless determination to get the truth in religion, even if we have to break down the Church walls to attain it. For religion is man's attitude in face of the ultimate reality."

This last paragraph looks rather promising until one reads the last chapter on "The Gospel of Reality," which is the chapter in which special attention is given to the contribution which religion has to make towards the solution of the problem. But in reading this chapter we soon discover that the author has very little use or respect for religion in any proper sense of the word, and still less for the Christian religion. In proof of this we quote the following:

"And yet the Almighty Ruler of the Universe is demonstrably the last of a long series of dreams, and we can now trace His evolution out of the tribal god, the ancestral ghost and the totem.....

"The official form of Christianity, which takes its stand upon the Gospels as historic documents, is ceasing to command the allegiance of educated men. Now that the full light of criticism has been turned upon them it is impossible to maintain that the weight of evidence is convincing enough to leave no room for reasonable doubt, even on such a fundamental tenet as the resurrection."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

SOCIOLOGICAL.

The Validity of American Ideals. By Shailer Mathews. The Abingdon Press. 12mo. 207 pages. Price \$1.25 net.

This volume contains six Lectures delivered at Wesleyan University on the George Slocum Bennett Foundation "For the Promotion of a Better Understanding of National Problems and of a More Perfect Realization of the Responsibilities of Citizenship." The subjects of the separate lectures are, The Test of Ideals; The Free Individual; Democracy; the Written Constitution; Cooperative Sovereignty; and Americanism as an Ideal. Dean Mathews has long been known throughout the nation as

a writer and speaker on these and kindred subjects. In these lectures he has made a new and valuable contribution to a better understanding and a wise solution of the problems which face us as American citizens and as a nation. The general spirit and aim of the lectures is very well expressed in the last paragraph of the closing one: "The next quarter of a century will see our nation pivotal in world history. Already it is becoming perhaps the greatest factor in the hopes of the world. To be loyal to its history as it extends into new conditions, to respect its institutions, its laws, and, above all, to cherish its great ideals of liberty, personality, and democracy is to insure that the America of tomorrow will serve its day as the America of the past has served the past and is serving the present. And our service will be that demanded by a world that has all but lost its hopes and its faiths—the maintenance of our idealism at home and the consecration of our resources and experience to the furthering of justice and well being throughout the world."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

DOGMATICS.

The Temptation of Our Lord. By the late Right Rev. H. J. C. Knight, D.D., Bishop of Gibraltar. With portrait of the author, and a brief sketch of his life by Bishop Montgomery. Cloth, pp. 162. The Macmillan Co. N. Y. 1922.

The present edition of this work is a reprint of the Hulsean Lectures, 1905-6. They are a profound study of our Lord's Temptation in which, though he was the Son of God, he learned obedience by what he suffered. He shows us how we in the trials of life may overcome. The author has a fine apprehension of the prophetic scriptures of the Old Testament in reference to our Lord. He has himself also a prophetic spirit in his interpretation of the Lord's temptation.

J. A. S.

The Incarnation and Personality. By Herbert A. Watson, D.D., Vicar of Cherry Hinton, Cambridge, Hulsean Lecturer in the University of Cambridge. The Macmillan Co., N. Y. Cloth. Pp. 221. Price \$1.75.

These learned lectures cover every phase of the Incarnation, including its relations and effects. The author

fully accepts the miracle of the virgin birth as the only explanation of the method of the incarnation. He holds also that the Personality of Christ was divine, to which he united a human nature. The one point in which the author seems to be at fault is in the idea that the Incarnation directly effected something like the regeneration of humanity, as though the latter were a generic substance. The new birth under this conception is the realization of the divinity within us. While the solidarity of the human race is no doubt a fact, it is not something that exists apart from individuals. There seems to be in Dr. Watson's theory a recrudescence of the ancient Greek teaching concerning the Incarnation.

J. A. S.

Creative Christianity, The Nathaniel W. Taylor Lectures at Yale Divinity School. By Professor George Cross, of the Rochester Seminary. New York. Cloth. Pp. 164. Price \$1.50.

Dr. Cross is a fine scholar, a good speaker and writer, whose lectures are a specious plea for Christianity, from which must be eliminated creeds, miracles and the authority of the Scriptures. No intelligent man can accept the alleged miracles other than the creations of fancy. They must be classed with the legends and myths of folk lore. In spite of this the Scriptures are all the better for it, for they represent a Christ whose power and influence on his disciples could not well be expressed in any other way. The Bible does not represent Christ as he actually was, but as he appeared to be to his humble followers. A shadowy Christ looking out from an uninspired book is, in the last analysis, what one gets from Dr. Cross' brilliant book. We appeal from Cross to Paul.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The New Testament Today. By Professor Ernest Findlay Scott, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1921. Cloth. Pp. 92.

Professor Scott's book reminds me of a temperature chart used by physicians. It is far from normal. Its discussions are now hot, now cold. A line connecting the points would go up and down like that on the doctor's chart. There are, indeed, two books curiously blended. One is positive; the other negative. You might go

through the volume and make a fine apologetic by the selection and combination of sentences. The remnant would be purely negative—worthy of the waste-basket.

It is curious how men of the author's type delude themselves by setting up men of straw. For instance, he writes (p. 87), "For one thing, it is no small matter that we can now feel reasonably certain of what the New Testament is, and what it is meant to teach us. In old days enquiry was forbidden. The book was simply thrust upon Christian men." When and where has this been done since the days of Luther? Only in the Catholic Church. Protestantism, born through a true apprehension of the Scriptures, has never denied their fullest investigation. Of course, it has resisted and must resist their rationalistic interpretation, but it cheerfully accepts, in its most orthodox circles, all that criticism has substantiated. The author himself at times revolts against the much-vaunted "historical criticism," but in fact is unduly influenced by it. The New Testament writers, in the author's opinion, were after all only children of their own day, without that larger view which orthodoxy attributes to them. Jesus himself, it is alleged, accepted contemporary apocalyptic beliefs "which have become to our minds so fantastic." Moreover, it is affirmed that from an early time our religion was seriously affected by what we have been told to regard as heathenism." All this is said in the face of the New Testament warnings and denunciations of heathen morals and philosophy.

The explanation of the attitude of the author is found in his ideas of inspiration and of faith. The former is the intuitive acceptance of the message of Jesus by those "in immediate contact with the life of Christ." The latter "is our response to the love of God, the demands of the moral law, the ideal set forth to us in the life and character of Jesus."

There is nothing here of a direct divine power and influence such as is claimed by the holy men who spoke as they were moved, carried along, swept away, by the Holy Ghost. There is nothing here of a faith, a personal trust, awakened in the soul by the Divine Spirit. In the last analysis it is naturalism with a thin disguise of something a little higher.

But the New Testament will go on justifying itself to millions, and leading inquiring souls to Him who is its chief content.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Fundamentals of Christianity. By Henry C. Vedder, Professor of Church History, Crozer Theological Seminary. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1922. Cloth. Pp. 250.

The avowed "object of this book is to convince its readers that the parting of the ways has been reached with the Historical Christianity based on Paul as its authority which still has such wide vogue, and that the future belongs to a Christianity that will determine its doctrines, program and methods on the authority of Jesus alone." It is one of the most offensively radical productions which has come to our notice for some time. Lest it be thought that it is the hasty deliverance of an excited fancy, the author assures us that "the entire book has been rewritten thrice, and much of it a fourth time." He, however, disclaims that he speaks "for the theological schools, beyond the fact that he has been a teacher in one of them for more than a quarter-century." Of his colleagues he says that he is fairly certain that one of them "would repudiate a considerable part of the book, and it is doubtful if a single one would approve the whole of it." This must be comforting to the author! No wonder that there is serious agitation in the Baptist Church for a truly evangelical creed.

In the first place, Dr. Vedder denies the inspiration and the infallibility of the Bible. He boldly challenges any one to cite any creed or authoritative utterance of any ecclesiastical body claiming infallibility for the Scriptures. In answer we cite from the Constitution of an ecclesiastical body which numbers about 800,000 members. In the Doctrinal Basis we read as follows: "The United Lutheran Church in America receives and holds the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the inspired Word of God, and as the only infallible rule to which all doctrines and teachers are to be judged." With this agrees the entire Lutheran Church in America, numbering two and one-half millions. It is the doctrine of the Westminster Confession, and practically avowed by the entire Protestant Church.

The complete answer to the main contention of Dr. Vedder's book is found in Dr. Machen's recent work entitled "The Origin of Paul's Religion," already favorably noticed in these columns.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

HYMNOLOGY.

The Story of the American Hymn. By Edward S. Ninde. The Abingdon Press, New York. Cloth. Pp. 429. Price \$3.50 net.

The Rev. Dr. Ninde, a Methodist pastor, has made a valuable contribution to American Hymnology in the handsome, well-illustrated book under review. It is purely historical, telling the story of the distinctively American hymn from the coming of the Pilgrim Fathers to the present. It starts with the "Bay Psalm Book" of 1640 as the background. After some notice of the Accomodated Psalm Book, the author proceeds to pioneer hymn-writers, like Dwight, Samuel Davies, Mathers, Byles and Alline. After entertaining chapters on Hymns on Death, the old-time singing, the Kist o'whistles, the author discusses "some early hymn-books." Among the most interesting writers is Mrs. Phoebe Hinsdale Brown (1783-1861) "the first female American hymnist" whose work is of abiding worth. She wrote "I love to Steal awhile away." Her son, Samuel R. Brown became a pioneer missionary to China in 1838, and in 1859 the first American Missionary to the newly opened empire of Japan.

It is significant that several of our most beautiful Christmas hymns were written by Dr. E. H. Sears, a Unitarian minister who believed in the deity of Christ. Due attention is given to Bryant, Holmes, Duffield, Whittier, Mrs. Stowe, Ray Palmer, Phillips Brooks, and many others.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

Jesus of Nazareth, A Biography, by George A. Barton, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Semitic Languages in the University of Pennsylvania, Professor of N. T. Literature and Language in the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Philadelphia; sometime Professor of Biblical Literature, etc., in Bryn Mawr College. New York, the Macmillan Co., 1922. Cloth. Pp. 396. Price, \$2.00.

This is a life of Jesus by a distinguished professor, but not the life outlined by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Their records are frequently discredited by the application of the alleged inductive method and by the constant

reminder that the disciples were poor, ignorant peasants who were still in the bonds of superstition.

The author is noncommittal on the Virgin Birth, with apparently negative leanings. Jesus, it is alleged, was hampered by serious limitations. "If, as Christians believe," says the author, "he was God incarnate, he was incarnated as a man of the first century and not as a man of the twentieth century" (page 137). This is a fundamental and fatal misconception. Jesus, it is true, submitted to the physical, social and racial influences of his day in a certain measure; but he was far above them. His moral judgment was as clear as noonday. He was not a man of any one century but of all. We have not left him behind in our boasted advances. He is incarnate man—for all and for all time.

In regard to miracles the author suggests in general that they may have occurred and that we cannot be sure that Jesus did not know and anticipate modern science. But his real belief comes out in practically discrediting individual miracles. Of the turning of water into wine he says, "This is one of the nature-miracles which it is hard for many modern people to believe." He says in general that the miracles of healing really happened. Jesus was the foremost magnetic personality that ever lived. "He possessed in supreme measure what is in modern times called 'psychic' power." Consequently when he came into Peter's house and found his wife's mother ill, he "went and took her by the hand . . . and from his calm, wholesome personality, which radiated, health, hope, courage, faith there went out to her healing. Her temperature dropped to normal; she felt well; she arose and helped in serving the midday meal."

The woman with a chronic disease was cured by the influence of Jesus in her imagination. She was restored by something like "mental and nervous reactions."

The man who was cured of leprosy "probably had one of the skin diseases which were counted as leprosy" and was really not a leper and his disease had about run its course. The son of the widow at Nain and the daughter of Jairus were really not dead, but in state of coma, and even Lazarus was only in a comatose condition!

We have cited illustrations at some length to put the unwary on their guard in purchasing this book to read it in the family circle, or as a gift to a grown youth or maiden, or as a text in high schools, as recommended by the publishers. In my judgment to do this would undermine the faith of the young by discrediting the Scrip-

tures. There are many excellencies in this volume. The author avows his belief in the resurrection of Jesus, but is far from clear in presenting the facts and the doctrine. He also accepts Jesus as Lord and Messiah and Revealer of God; but if he has clearly affirmed his belief in the Deity of Christ it has escaped my notice.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

The Unseen Side of Child Life. By Elizabeth Harrison, President Emeritus of National Kindergartner and Training College. The Macmillan Company, New York. 1922. Cloth. Pp. 179. Price \$1.25.

This is a new book on the training of young children. Add it to the family library. Miss Harrison has given a long time to the study of child life. She knows its philosophy thoroughly, loves children and is loved by them. Her book is not given to theory, but is eminently practical. Her reputation as a writer on children appears in the fact that her "Story of Child Nature" has passed through forty-five editions.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CHRISTIAN NARRATIVE.

The Training of Children in the Christian Family. By Luther Allan Weigle, professor of Christian Nurture in Yale University. The Pilgrim Press, Boston. Cloth. Pp. 224. Price, \$1.50.

Child Versus Parent. The Irrepressible Conflict. By Rabbi Stephen Wise. The Macmillan Co., New York. Cloth. Pp. 139. Price, \$1.25.

It is a hopeful sign of the times that increasing attention is being given to the consideration of home training. There can be no doubt that family discipline has been relaxed and that there must be a return to the old ways with adaptations to the present age.

Rabbi Wise, a well known popular lecturer, writes, of course, from the Jewish standpoint; but wisdom is wisdom wherever it comes from. Parents may learn much from Dr. Wise, but they can learn more from Dr. Weigle, because he writes from the Christian standpoint in which we have all that both Testaments teach. He writes for parents in a simple yet systematic manner. His book is a family text-book which someone should pre-

sent to every newly-married couple. His wide acquaintance with the literature of nurture enables him to weave into his discussions many admirable quotations. His themes cover the whole child life—environment, health, habits, play, work, study, relations to others, to the Church, and to God.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

STORY SERMONS.

Old Joe and Other Stories. By Shepherd Knapp. The Abingdon Press, New York. 12mo. 297 pages. Price \$2.00 net.

In the Preface to this volume the author explains that for some years he has followed the custom of telling a story at the Sunday evening Vesper Service instead of preaching a sermon, or as he expresses it, "the sermon has been preached in the form of a story." He also tells us that these stories are told extemporaneously, but that he has subsequently written out in full the ones reproduced in this book. There are sixteen of them, each one being prefaced by a text of scripture which it is intended to illustrate. The stories are well told, and it may be natural for the author to express the hope that these examples of his own work will stir up some of his fellow parsons to try their hands at pulpit story-telling. But story telling is an art, and requires peculiar gifts of sympathy and imagination which not many ministers possess. Besides, many ministers would not regard this as a proper substitute for the sermon even if it should "draw" a larger audience and better hold their attention for the time. Most preachers, however, might get from the reading of these stories some valuable hints on the use of stories or interesting incidents of real life for purposes of illustration.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

WAYS OF SERVING.

Modern Christian Callings. Edited by E. Hershey Sneath. The Macmillan Company. New York. 12mo. 89 pages. Price 75 cents.

One of the volumes in "The Christian Service Series" being published under the general editorship of Dr. Sneath of Yale University. It contains three very helpful papers by men who may be regarded as experienced

and competent advisors for young men especially in the particular lines on which they write. The first paper, of 27 pages, is on "Biblical Teaching in School and College," by Irving F. Wood, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Comparative Religion in Smith College. The second paper which covers 19 pages is on "Executives for Church Enterprises," by Dwight H. Day, Executive Secretary of Missions of the Presbyterian Church. The third is on "Opportunities for Social Service," by William Bailey, Ph.D., formerly Professor of Practical Philanthropy at Yale, and occupies the remaining 43 pages of the book. A good book for young men who are facing the problem of deciding in what way they can best serve God and humanity, or for such as may have already decided on one of the callings discussed.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Return of Christendom. By a group of Churchmen, with an Introduction by Bishop Gore, and an Epilogue by G. K. Chesterton. Introduction to the American edition by Bishop Brent. The Macmillan Co., N. Y. Cloth. Pp. 252. Price \$1.75.

There are nine essays in this volume: 1. The Idea of Christendom in Relation to Modern Society, by M. B. Reckitt. 2. The Return of Dogma by H. H. Slesser. 3. The Necessity of Catholic Dogma by Fr. L. S. Thornton. 4. The Return of the Kingdom of God, by P. E. T. Widdrington. 5. The Mediaeval Theory of Social Order by A. J. Carlyle. 6. The Object of Industrialism by A. J. Penty. 7. The Moralization of Property by M. B. Reckitt. 8. The Failure of Marxism by Niles Carpenter. 9. The Kingdom of God and the Church of To-day by Fr. Paul B. Bull.

The first essayist believes that "capitalist industry" is a flat failure as a creator of a stable social order, and that labor which has provoked a crisis is bewildered and confused. Socialism in its various forms has failed also. In the last analysis a truly Christian spirit alone can bring about a condition where freedom will lead to peace.

In the seventh essay the failure of the present order is pointed out and a species of Christian communism is advocated. The eighth essay exposes the fallacies of

Marxism as a cure of social ills. It persists only because of its half-truths and its "moral baseness." The former are a learned statement of common beliefs fostered by labor; and the latter is an appeal to passion, vindictiveness and class-war. Marxism is a failure, if for no other reason than its utter lack of the thought of human brotherhood. The essay on Industrialism advocates the limitation of machinery. Handwork must supplant it. The safety of society is dependent on the revival of guilds. At present art is crushed between the upper and nether millstone of plutocracy and industrialism. There is an imperative need to get back to the true basis of art which is found in religion. The essay on the Mediaeval Theory of Social Order is a plea to return to the conception of law as the embodiment of Justice and not as a code in which absolute authority is vested. The essays on Dogma advocate a return to the old orthodox faith as the fundamental basis of true progress. In the essay on "The Kingdom of God and the Church Today" the writer says that the application of the Catholic faith to our industrial and economic life may be summed up in three words: Faith, Freedom, Fellowship. In the Epilogue Mr. Chesterton expresses the belief that the faith of the past was relatively better than that of our modern age in which selfishness is triumphant. In the end the Church will survive all attacks. "The Christian religion has died daily; its enemies have only died." "The Church is dying as usual; but the modern world is dead; and cannot be raised save in the fashion of Lazarus."

These essays are all animated by the faith and the hope of the Gospel. The return to its fundamental principles is the only remedy of modern ills. While somewhat reactionary in some of the ideals upheld, on the whole, the book points out the way of safety. We are at present paying a frightful price for departure from the teachings of our Lord.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

